DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 059 154 SP 005 480

AUTHOR Zahorik, John
TITLE Description and Analysis of Selected Aspects of Teacher Education Programs and Students in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction.
INSTITUTION Wisconsin Univ., Milwaukee.
PUB DATE 71
NOTE 103p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58
DESCRIPTORS *Educational Improvement; *Education Courses; *Research Projects; *Student Teaching; *Teacher Education

ABSTRACT

Drastic changes in the teaching market, the nature of our times, and the support of universities demand an examination of present teacher education programs. This investigation set out to examine selected aspects of teacher education programs as a basis for establishing the future direction of the total teacher education program of the Department of Curriculum and Instruction. The problems investigated were 1) What is the nature of the components of the program, 2) What is the perceived value of selected subcomponents, and 3) What is the nature of the students. The general design was to obtain data concerning programs through instructor interviews and logs, student questionnaires and interviews, and cooperating teacher questionnaires, and student data through questionnaires, examinations, and other instruments. The results for programs are examined in detail in four sections: description by instructors, by present students, by graduated students, and by cooperating teachers, followed by details of the results concerning students. Many conclusions and implications resulted from the study, but the overall conclusion is that although the programs appear to prepare technically competent teachers for existing schools, they do not have a vigorous urban thrust, a future orientation emphasis, or a strong experimental posture. The instruments used are included in nine appendixes. (MBM)

ED059154

DESCRIPTION AND ANALYSIS OF SELECTED ASPECTS OF TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS AND STUDENTS IN THE DEPARTMENT OF CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-MILWAUKEE

JOHN ZAHORIK

FALL 1971

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

SP005480

ADVISORY COMMITTEE:
Bernice Blakely
Martin Haberman
Grace Lund
Donald Neuman
Elizabeth Wheeler

RESEARCH ASSISTANTS:
Isabel Higgs
Robert Ubbelohde

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. PURPOSE AND PROBLEM	1
Rationale	1
Problem	2
II. PROCEDURES	4
Program Data Instruments	4
Student Data Instruments	7
III. RESULTS CONCERNING PROGRAMS	9
Description by University Instructors	9
Description of Programs	10
Analysis of Programs	20
Description and Evaluation by Present Students	29
Evaluation by Graduated Students	41
Evaluation by Cooperating Teachers	43
IV. RESULTS CONCERNING STUDENTS	45
V. CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS	58
APPENDICES	

I
PURPOSE AND PROBLEM

Rationale

It is over. The teacher shortage that has plagued the United States for the last two decades no longer exists. Currently there is an over supply of teachers at nearly all levels and in nearly all areas with the possible exception of nursery school, handicapped, physical education, and industrial arts teaching. The ratio of qualified teaching applicants to teaching positions in 1970 ranged from up to 50 to 1 in some suburbs to 3 to 1 in large cities. In Milwaukee for example, 2000 persons applied for 700 vacant positions in the spring of 1970. Presently the oversupply is even greater. According to the National Education Association there was a 38,000 teacher surplus in 1969. It is estimated that the surplus will grow to 55,000 a year by 1975. From 1970 to 1980 it is predicted that there will be 4.2 million teachers available to fill only 2.4 million positions.

It is different. Although all men probably knew their age as one of frighteningly rapid change, the present seems to be a time of particularly rapid change. Many view the late 1960's and the 1970's as a transitional period that will usher in living patterns that are substantially different from those that have existed in the recent past. Ferment, doubt, and involvement are seen everywhere in relation to our bursting population, our expanding urban centers, our deteriorating physical environment, our international commitments, our technological efforts, our institutions, our social customs, our humanity. The changes that are evolving in our society today are and will be increasingly reflected in schools. Schools and teaching will probably be different phenomena than they were. Not only will we need fewer teachers in the years ahead in relation to the jobs that are available, but we will probably need teachers who have the abilities and knowledge backgrounds to function in the schools that will exist in the years ahead.

It is expensive. To adequately prepare a person to become a teacher is an expensive endeavor. The cost of teacher education is rising swiftly while the willingness and ability to support university programs of all types is dwindling. Contributions, state funds, and other funds have decreased alarmingly as those who govern and support universities have begun to question the role or purpose of the university in light of recent campus activities and events. Projections are that universities will have to operate on limited budgets in the period we are now approaching. It means that well organized, effective programs in all areas including teacher education might be maintained and that other programs might be eliminated.

Drastic changes in the teaching market, the nature of our times, and the support of universities demand an examination of present teacher education programs. Their nature and effectiveness need to be determined as an initial step in meeting the challenge of these changes. On the basis of thorough examination of existing programs, the decision to maintain existing programs, alter existing programs, or develop new programs can be made.

It is the purpose of this investigation to examine selected aspects of teacher education programs in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction as a basis for establishing the future direction of the total teacher education program of the department.

Problem

The specific problems investigated in this project were the following:

1. What is the nature of the student teaching, accompanying seminars, and preceding methods courses components of the teacher education programs of the Department of Curriculum and Instruction?

2. What is the perceived value of selected subcomponents of the student teaching, accompanying seminars, and preceding methods courses components of the teacher education programs of the Department of Curriculum and Instruction?

3. What is the nature of the students who are in the process of completing a teacher education program in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction?

This study was concerned with five major programs and twenty subprograms or sections of these programs. The programs and subprograms researched were:

1. Nursery-Kindergarten - Primary Integrated Program (N-3)
   a. Nursery Kindergarten. Sect. 1
   b. Nursery Kindergarten. Sect. 2
   c. Primary. Sect. 1
   d. Primary. Sect. 2

2. Elementary Integrated Program (1-6)
   a. Professional Semester. Sect. 1
   b. Professional Semester. Sect. 2
   c. Professional Semester (Center). Sect. 3
   d. Regular Two Semester Group. Sect. 1
   e. Trainers of Teacher Trainers. Sect. 1
   f. Trainers of Teacher Trainers. Sect. 2
   g. Project Together. Sect. 1

3. Junior High-Middle School Program (7-9)
   a. Project Together. Sect. 1

4. Senior High School Program
   a. English. Sect. 1
   b. Social Studies. Sect. 1
   c. Mathematics. Sect. 1
   d. Science. Sect. 1
   e. Foreign Languages. Sect. 1

5. Intern Program
   a. Primary. Sect. 1
   b. Elementary. Sect. 1
   c. Secondary. Sect. 1

Although all twenty subprograms were part of the evaluation, not all subprograms participated in the investigation to the same extent. Because Project Together in the Elementary Integrated Program was a first-semester program, the Mathematics section of the Senior High School Program was small, and for other reasons few data concerning some programs were acquired, and in reality the study dealt with fewer than twenty subprograms.

Other programs such as the Institute in Education and High Impact Teams were not investigated because of their marginal relationship to the Department of Curriculum and Instruction and their heavy involvement in their own evaluation.

The aspects of the programs selected for study were those over which the Department of Curriculum and Instruction has the greatest control: student teaching and the accompanying integrated course work. Since in the case of Senior High programs, the methods courses are not integrated but precede student teaching, these were investigated along with the periodic student teaching seminars in those programs. Course requirements outside the Department such as School and Society, Philosophy of Education, Learning and Development, and Appraisal and Evaluation as well as other Curriculum and Instruction courses were not part of the study. In many instances, however, students provided unsolicited information about these requirements.

The students which this study sought to describe and examine were the students in the twenty subprograms. Most, but not all, of the information acquired concerns students who were in their last or only semester of student teaching. The intention was to establish baseline data on students who were completing their programs.

II
PROCEDURES

The programs and students that this investigation sought to describe and analyze were the programs offered and the students in attendance during the first semester of the 1970-71 academic year. The general design was to obtain data concerning programs through instructor interviews and logs, student questionnaires and interviews, and cooperating teacher questionnaires, and student data through questionnaires, examinations, and other instruments.

Program Data Instruments

The specific instruments employed with the various individuals to obtain descriptions and evaluations of the five teacher education programs were the following:

1. Instructors

   Logs. Each of the twenty instructors[1] of the twenty subprograms were requested to complete a weekly log for the entire semester. Each week they were given and asked to complete a log sheet[2] consisting of three questions. They were asked to indicate the objectives their students achieved, the activities they utilized, and the evaluative techniques they employed. In addition, they were asked to describe any other aspects of their activities for that week that did not readily fit this format, and they were asked to submit along with the log all reproduced materials used during the week.

   Interviews. Each of the twenty instructors was asked to submit to an indepth, structured interview conducted by a member of the research team. These interviews were conducted during the months of November and December. They took approximately one hour to complete. An Instructor Interview Schedule[3] was created and used. It focused on the goals, content, materials, learning activities, and evaluation of the seminars and methods courses; on type, duration, teacher role, evaluation, and other matters concerning the student teaching experience; and on various topics dealing with the total program. Syllabi, bibliographies, and other materials used to give general direction to programs were acquired during the interviews.

---

[1] In cases where subprograms were being taught by a team of instructors, logs were either done jointly or by one team member.

[2] See Appendix A for log sheet.

[3] See Appendix B for Instructor Interview Schedule.

2. Present Students

Questionnaires. Students in all twenty subprograms were asked to complete a questionnaire concerning numerous aspects of their teacher education programs. The instrument, Student Questionnaire[4], consisted of fifteen items that requested students to provide descriptions or evaluations of the outcomes of their programs, how their programs could be improved, the positive and negative qualities of their experiences, and of other related topics. The instrument was distributed during December and January to approximately 350 students.

Interviews. In an effort to obtain additional program description and evaluation that could not easily be secured with the Student Questionnaire, indepth interviews were conducted with selected groups of students. The Student Group Interview Schedule[5] was developed and used to structure the interviews. The major items with which it dealt were personal characteristics, goals and goal achievement, evaluation, prediction about student's professional future, teaching competence, and overall evaluation of the teacher education program. Each of the twenty program instructors was requested to select three to five students to be interviewed using any selection method he wished. The interviews were held during January and took approximately one hour to complete. They were conducted by a group of graduate students under the direction of one of the research assistants. These graduate students, who had been studying the interview process as a course requirement, were also responsible in large part for developing the interview schedule.

3. Graduated Students

Questionnaires. A total of forty students who had finished their teacher education programs within the last three years were asked to complete a questionnaire, Self-Evaluation Questionnaire for Graduated Students[6]. This questionnaire, developed by the researchers, was designed to have graduated students rate the level of their preparedness for assuming a teaching position as a result of the teacher education program in which they participated. The instrument consisted of 29 items mostly concerning a variety of learnings or possible outcomes from programs, such as, ability to plan, knowledge of teaching skills, knowledge of child development, and acquisition of motivation techniques. The questionnaires were distributed in February to approximately equal numbers of graduated K-3, 1-6, 7-9 and 10-12, and intern students.

---

[4]See Appendix C for Student Questionnaire.

[5]See Appendix D for Student Group Interview Schedule.

[6]See Appendix E for Self-Evaluation Questionnaire for Graduated Students.

4. Cooperating Teachers

Questionnaire. The questionnaire administered to graduated students for self-evaluation was altered slightly and administered to cooperating teachers to obtain their perception of the preparedness of the student teachers with whom they had worked during the past three years. The instrument, Student Teacher Evaluation Questionnaire for Cooperating Teachers[7], was administered to approximately eight cooperating teachers in each of the N-3, 1-6, 7-9 and 10-12, and Intern programs during the month of February.

---

[7]See Appendix F for Student Teacher Evaluation Questionnaire for Cooperating Teachers.

Student Data Instruments

The instruments used to provide information on students presently participating in the five teacher education programs were the following:

1. Questionnaires. Students in all twenty programs were asked to complete a questionnaire concerning their education, family, and work experience backgrounds as well as their interests and professional goals and motivations. The questionnaire, Student Information Form[8], was distributed during December and January to approximately 350 students.

2. Knowledge Examination. All students who were involved in student teaching during the fall semester and were in the process of completing the requirements of their teacher education program were requested to submit to an examination. The instrument used, Knowledge Instrument (KI)[9], was developed by the researchers from several sources. Of the 77 items of which it was composed, the first 57 were multiple-choice items taken from the National Teacher Examination, the next 19 were multiple-choice items constructed by the researchers, and the last is an open-ended item. Initially a pool of 89 items from the National Teacher Examination dealing with learning, individual differences, evaluation, history or philosophy, and human growth and development was identified. These items were administered to several classes of graduate students and on the basis of an analysis of these test results 32 items were found to be unsuitable and were discarded. The 19 newly created items were designed to measure students' knowledge of current topics, ideas, and authorities. These items dealt with curriculum, instruction, administration, school organization, urban education, and child development. They were administered to several groups of graduate students, also, and in several instances revisions were necessary. The complete instrument was administered during two special examination sessions in January. It took approximately 45 minutes to complete.

3. Attitude Inventory. The Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory (MTAI) was administered to students completing their teacher education program at two special examination sessions in January. This instrument "is designed to measure those attitudes of a teacher which predict how well he will get along with pupils in interpersonal relationships, and indirectly how well satisfied he will be with teaching as a vocation."[10] The instrument itself contains 150 attitudinal statements about which the student indicates his agreement or disagreement. It took approximately 30 minutes to complete.

4. Personality Inventory. To determine general personality traits or manifest needs of students completing their teacher education programs, the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule (EPPS) was administered at two special examination sessions in January. The EPPS was created

---

[8]See Appendix G for Student Information Form.

[9]See Appendix H for Knowledge Instrument.

[10]Walter W. Cook et. al. Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory Manual. New York: The Psychological Corporation, p. 3.

"To provide quick and convenient measures of a number of relatively independent normal personality variables."[11] The variables are: (1) achievement, (2) deference, (3) order, (4) exhibition, (5) autonomy, (6) affiliation, (7) intraception, (8) succorance, (9) dominance, (10) abasement, (11) nurturance, (12) change, (13) endurance, (14) heterosexuality, and (15) aggression.[12] The instrument consists of 225 pairs of statements of which the subject must select the one from each pair for which he has greater preference. The EPPS as well as the MTAI were selected for use because of their well established norms with education and general populations and their wide use in numerous other investigations of teachers.

The data obtained from the program instruments were examined for trends, likenesses, and differences among the five major teacher education programs. Attempts were made to quantify these data wherever possible, although in many cases results are presented in narrative statement form only.

Data obtained from the student instruments, excluding the questionnaire which was treated in a similar fashion as the program data, were submitted to computer analysis. Means and standard deviations were determined for the total program and each of the five major programs. To determine significant difference among mean scores and between mean scores and norms one-way analysis of variance and other tests were used.

---

[11]Allen L. Edwards. Edwards Personal Preference Schedule Manual. New York: The Psychological Corporation, 1959, p. 5.

[12]See Appendix I for description of the variables.

III
RESULTS CONCERNING PROGRAMS

DESCRIPTION BY UNIVERSITY INSTRUCTORS

Introduction

The purpose of this description of teacher education programs is two-fold. First, an attempt has been made to describe curricular and instructional practices and patterns within each of four groups of programs in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction: N-3, 1-9, 10-12, and Intern. Second, an attempt was made to bring meaning to these programs by comparing them to specified sets of criteria or expectations.

The following descriptions of programs are based on data collected through interviews, weekly logs, and supplementary information gleaned from instructional materials used by the instructors.

Programs and subprograms examined in this section are somewhat different from those in other sections. The 1-6 and 7-9 programs were compressed into one group for this analysis because the one 7-9 subprogram and one of the 1-6 subprograms were both Project Together programs and nearly identical in purpose and format. This resulted in 7 subprograms in the 1-9 program or group. The N-3 program was composed of 3 subprograms, the 10-12 program of 3, and the Intern program of 3 for a total of 16 subprograms. This is several less than the total number of subprograms in actual operation because not all of the instructors were interviewed or returned logs. Also, since the Secondary English and Social Studies instructors conducted joint seminars, these two groups were merged.

To facilitate the reporting of information about the curricular and instructional practices found within each of the four groups of programs, the following five components or aspects of programs have been treated separately:

1. Curricular patterns
2. Student goals (Type of teacher desired)
3. Content goals (Information and skill objectives)
4. Type of student teaching experience
5. Supervision of student teachers

Description of Programs

Curriculum Patterns

In an attempt to categorize the variety of curricular planning patterns which were described in the interviews held with instructors, supervisors, or teams responsible for each of the sixteen programs being described, four common organizational patterns have been selected: (1) Separate Subjects Curriculum, (2) Activity Curriculum, (3) Broadfield Curriculum, and (4) Core Curriculum. Each of these four curriculum planning patterns was defined prior to categorization of the programs as follows:

1. Separate Subject Curriculum. This pattern of curriculum planning uses units or blocks of subject matter as the basis for an instructional program. The curriculum is predetermined for students by the instructor and instruction often tends toward the instructor lecturing or telling. Students are typically assigned a rather passive role as listener and rememberer.

2. Activity Curriculum. A curriculum organized in this manner combines the identification of a few general categories or areas of student needs and interests by the instructor with instruction in regard to these broad areas being determined to a great extent by the expressed concerns and interests of the students. Subject matter in this curricular pattern is typically viewed as a resource to be utilized as needed. Unlike the separate subject curriculum, the activity curriculum is not pre planned but rather emerges during the course of the instructional program. The teacher in this pattern typically assumes the role of guide or facilitator with instruction taking the form of discussions rather than lectures.

3. Broad Fields Curriculum. This pattern of curriculum planning is similar to that of the separate subjects curriculum insofar as subject matter retains its primacy as a determinant of instructional practice, although in the broad fields curriculum related subject matter areas are grouped together for instructional purposes. As in the separate subject curriculum, the instructional methods tend to be those of telling or showing by the instructor and the curriculum is typically predetermined.

4. Core Curriculum. In this pattern for curriculum planning, both student interests and subject matter are rejected as primary organizational foci and essential activities are identified and used to structure instructional practice. For example, certain basic teaching activities such as guidance, discipline, and subject matter competency might be identified and used as organizing centers for a teacher training program. Values and valuing tend to be emphasized in this approach and subject matter tends to be viewed as a resource. A broadly determined or preplanned curriculum leaves room for teacher-student planning within the plan of instruction.

Given these definitions of general types of curriculum planning, an attempt was made to categorize the four programs. It is important to remember in regard to these categorizations of programs that what is being categorized is an emphasis or trend within each program abstracted from the descriptions of curriculum planning provided by instructors in interviews and supplementary materials. While the result of this attempted categorization may be no more than the suggestion that further work be done to more adequately describe programs, the tendency toward one curricular pattern rather than another within programs may be a factor involved in explaining the type of teacher actually being developed in a program, assuming that instructional practices or media following from such curricular patterns is at least a part of the message being received or learned by prospective teachers.

The data presented in Table I reveal that none of the subprograms employs a separate subjects curriculum pattern, the broad fields' pattern is employed somewhat, but it is the activity and core curriculum patterns that are used most extensively. By programs it can be seen that the N-3 program is primarily broad field, the 1-9 program is activity is in the intern program, and the 10-12 program is core.

TABLE I

CATEGORIZATION OF SUBPROGRAMS BY FOUR CURRICULAR PATTERNS

Program	Curricular Paterns			
	Separate Subject	Activity	Core	Broad Fields
N-3			1	2
1-9		6	1	
10-12			3	
Intern		3		
Total		9	5	2

While the summary of the descriptive information collected reveals differences among the programs in regard to curricular planning patterns, a problem arose in categorizing the programs due in part to the integral relationship in most cases between seminar or methods classes and the student teaching experience. Since both the nature of curriculum planning and instructional methods in regard to student teaching experiences tend to result in a less structured orientation, the description of a total program may be different than if just a methods class or seminar were to be described. This may have resulted in classifying the 10-12 program as having a core curriculum pattern. A further complication is the use of lab sections or discussion sections in addition to lecture or presentation sessions. To categorize a program in terms of these relationships among components may be to ignore the unique and distinctive nature of each component. Since the teaching experience of students is the focal point for some programs, to selectively ignore student teaching experiences or lab sections would be to provide a distorted view of these programs. Aside from these difficulties related to categorizing programs, it is possible that the resulting view of programs reflects the general view presented or developed by students or an outside observer who may tend to view the components collectively as "the program".

Information about curriculum patterns when regarded in light of other information in this report may suggest investigation of:

1. The relation, if any, between curriculum patterns and the knowledge acquired by students.

2. Curricular patterns and student "success" or "failure" in student teaching and as full-time teachers.

3. Curricular patterns and student teacher perception of a teacher's role.

4. Curriculum patterns in teacher training programs and curriculum and instructional patterns used by student teachers and graduates of these programs.

Student Goals

During the interview conducted with instructors or supervisors, a number of questions were asked concerning the type of teacher it was hoped the program they were responsible for was helping to develop. A summary of the responses given is reported in Table II. This list of student goals is a condensed version of all the responses that were given. When instructors used different but similar terms to express what seemed to be the same goal, the various responses were grouped together and assigned an inclusive label or heading. This process resulted in 19 goals which were then categorized into 4 areas and a miscellaneous category that seemed to emerge naturally.

From Table II it can be seen that as a total program or group, what the instructors of the programs hold as goals for students in order of importance are: student centered, creative, open to ideas, change agent oriented, humane, and self-evaluative. Of somewhat lesser importance are the goals of urban teaching, community awareness, and leadership in education. By individual programs the major student goals are: N-3 -- creative, self-evaluative, open to ideas, ability to relate theory to practice, student centered, and being effective in general;

TABLE 11
STUDENT GOALS FOR FOUR PROGRAMS
AS IDENTIFIED BY INSTRUCTORS

Student Goals	Programs				
	N-3	1-9	10-12	Intern	Total
General:					
Urban teacher		2*		3	5
Effective teacher	2	1			3
Educational leader	1	2		2	5
Successful teacher				1	1
Competent teacher			3		3
Committed teacher		1		1	2
Innovative:					
Creative	3	2	2	2	9
Open to ideas	2	3		2	7
Change agent	1	3	2	1	7
Student oriented:					
Student centered	2	4	2	3	11
Humane	1	4	1	1	7
Specific skills:					
Communication		1	1		2
Decision-making	1	1			2
Self-evaluative	3	3		1	7
Task oriented	1		1		2
Relating theory to practice	2				2
Self-developing	1	1			2
Miscellaneous:					
Aware of community	1	3		1	5
Upgrade professional standards			1		1

*Numbers refer to quantity of instructors who identified the goal indicated. Maximum totals for the programs are: N-3 - 3; 1-9 - 7; 10-12 - 3; Intern - 3.

1-9 -- student centered, humane, open to ideas, change agent, self-evaluative, and aware of community; 10-12 -- competent, creative, change agent, and student centered; and Intern -- student centered, urban, creative, open to ideas, and leadership. It is clear that most of the goals center around innovation and student orientation. Urban teacher and other urban aspects such as community awareness, leadership, and change are emphasized but are not the most frequently mentioned goals. However, it should be kept in mind that the fact that a possible response was not given by an instructor does not necessarily mean that he felt it was unimportant. Various instructors may have used different terms to suggest these goals. Also, the interview format and length of time involved may have restricted the number and types of student goals identified by the instructors.

Content Goals

On the basis of the interviews, logs, and supplementary information collected from the instructors and supervisors of the programs, it is possible to describe the content goals (i.e., knowledge and skill objectives) of each program. The general categories or topics used to record the knowledge and skill objectives of each program were obtained by first listing current issues and topics found in recent issues of the NEA Journal, Phi Delta Kappan, and other journals. On the basis of topics dealt with in these publications during the years of 1968-71, an initial list of general topics was made and program objectives related to these general issues were recorded. Content objectives of each program which could not be categorized on the basis of the original list were added to the list. Where program objectives seemed similar, a general category was used to cover all related objectives for convenience. Finally, the resulting 68 goals were grouped into 11 areas or classes. Any topics which appeared on the list developed from recent publications but were not dealt with by any programs were dropped from the final report of the content objectives.

TABLE III
CONTENT GOALS FOR FOUR PROGRAMS
AS IDENTIFIED BY INSTRUCTORS

Content goals	Programs				
	N-3	1-9	10-12	Intern	Total
Curriculum:					
Curriculum design	3*	2	1	2	8
Instructional objectives	1	4	3	1	9
Educational goals	1	2	2	1	6
Lesson planning		7	2	1	10
Unit planning		3			3
Curriculum guides		2			2
Instruction:					
Study of teaching	3	6	3	3	15
Interaction analysis	2	3	2		7
Classroom questions	1	4	2		7
Teaching models and theory			1		1
Microteaching		2	1	1	4
Instructional techniques	3	6	3	2	14
Communication	1	2	3	1	7
Group dynamics	1	5			6
Grouping for instruction		5	1		6
Methodology:					
Behavior modification		2			2
Programed learning		1	1		2
Simulation	2	4	1	1	8
Games		3			3
Plays	2	1			3
Problem solving		2	1		3
Creativity	2				2
Value development		4	2		6
Individualized instruction	1	5	1	2	9
Open classrooms	1	2		2	5
Self-directed learning				1	1
Innovative programs			2	1	3
Central-city teaching			2	1	3
Record keeping	1	4	1		6
Content:					
Social studies and minorities		1			1
Drugs			1		1
Art	3	3		1	7
Physical education	2				2
Specific subject matter	3	7	3	2	15

TABLE III
(CONT.)

Resources:					
Learning materials	2	7	3	3	15
Use of media	2	3	3	1	9
Field trips	2	1	1		4
Administration Organization:					
Urban schools		2	1	1	4
School-staff dynamics		2	1		3
Institutional change		3	1		4
Classroom design	3	2			5
Supervisory roles	1	2			3
Nongraded		2			2
Team teaching		1			1
Students:					
Discipline and Management	1	4	1	1	7
Teacher-student relations	1	3	2		6
Learning disabilities	2	3	1	1	7
Diagnosing student problems	1	3	1	1	6
Testing		2	2	1	5
Evaluation	1	2	3	2	10
Grading	1	2		2	5
Community:					
Home-school relations	2	4		1	7
Political organization of communities	1	2	1		4
Knowledge about communities	1	5	2		8
Professional:					
Certification	3	1	1	2	7
Professional organization	3	5	2	2	12
Foundations:					
History of education	2	1	1		4
Education in other countries			1		1
Philosophy	2	2			4
Current issues & trends	3	3	2	1	9
Minority cultures		1	1		2
Psychology		3	1		4
Learning theory	3	6	3	1	14
Educational technology	1		2		3
Educational research	1		1	1	3
Miscellaneous:					
Student teaching	1	2	1		4
Educational publications	2	2	2		6
Brainstorming		2			2

*Numbers refer to quantity of instructors who identified the goal indicated. Maximum totals for the programs are: N-3 - 3; 1-9 - 7; 10-12 - 3; Intern - 3.

The data concerning content goals of the various programs as perceived by instructors are contained in Table III. It can be seen from this table for all programs combined, the knowledge and skill objectives identified by the most instructors in order of frequency of occurrence are: study of teaching in general, specific subject matter content, learning materials, instructional techniques, learning theory, professional organizations, lesson planning, and evaluation. At least 10 or more of the 16 instructors or instructional teams selected these goals. For each subprogram the goals which at least three-fourths of the instructors of each subprogram selected are:

1. N-3: Curriculum design, study of teaching, instructional techniques, art, specific subject matter, classroom design, certification, professional organizations, current issues, and learning theory.

2. 1-9: Lesson planning, specific subject matter, learning materials, study of teaching, instructional techniques, and learning theory.

3. 10-12: Instructional objectives, study of teaching, instructional techniques, communication, specific subject matter, learning materials, use of media, evaluation, and learning theory.

4. Intern: Study of teaching and learning materials.

Although there are some differences among programs particularly with regard to the 1-9 program and its emphasis on lesson planning and other types of planning its comparative emphasis on group dynamics, grouping for instruction, and communication, for the most part the programs are similar in the content goals they stress and do not stress. One area of special interest is the general topic of urban education. It appears that it is of minor importance in terms of content goals. Minority cultures, institutional change, learning disabilities, community relations and other topics that might be grouped under the umbrella term of urban education received secondary emphasis.

When the student goals and the content goals are compared it can be seen that although all of the goals could be being developed, on the basis of the terms the instructors used it is likely that some are not. Topics directly associated with openness, change, humanism, and creativity are either not identified as content goals or are only selected by a few instructors.

In interpreting these results concerning content goals caution is again urged. First, since a certain amount of interpretation by the categorizer was necessary, it is conceivable that some of the content objectives of a program were mis-categorized. Further, since instructors and supervisors described their programs at varying levels of generality and within varying frameworks, some of the topics listed necessarily over-lap. For example, "Instructional Objectives" and "Educational Goals" may conceivably over-lap each other not to mention other possible over-lapping categories.

Type of Student Teaching Experience

Although there is some variation in regard to student teaching placements among the four programs, most entail a student's placement in a public school with one teacher for a period of a semester. The N-3 and Intern programs which consist of a year long teaching experience are an exception to this practice. Students in the N-3 program typically student teach mornings only, 1-6 students teach some half days and some whole days on a predetermined schedule that amounts to approximately half day student teaching over the semester. Students in the 7-9 program and students in the 10-12 program teach one to three class periods per day while Intern students teach whole days.

Of these 16 subprograms, 4 are based on a student teaching center concept or are beginning to move toward a center organization. That is, all students are placed in one school; the placement involves flexibility in duration, type of activity, age level of students, and in other ways; provisions are made for numerous experiences outside the centers; seminar sessions are back in the center school; school faculty and administration are involved in the teacher education process as well as in their own continuing development; community participation is sought and developed. These 4 subprograms are all in the 1-9 programs. Interest was expressed by instructors in other kinds of innovative placements such as team teaching placements but at present most of the placements, excluding the 4 beginning centers, consist of from one to four students in the same school each under the direction of one cooperating teacher with seminar sessions held at the University.

Presently there is an emphasis on inner-city student teaching placement in all programs. Most students have some exposure to teaching in an inner-city school with the possible exception of students in the 10-12 program. Students in one-semester programs or the year long Intern program often have inner-city placements at the expense of variety of teaching placements. Two-semester programs such as the N-3 program can and do provide both inner-city and outer-city or suburban teaching experiences for students.

Supervision of Student Teachers

Supervision of student teachers typically involves day-to-day observation and conferencing by cooperating teachers with periodic visits and conferences by university personnel. The supervision by university instructors varies from two to three visits for each student per semester to weekly visits for students who are in need of special help. With the possible exception of students placed in centers, supervisory visits by university instructors average four per semester in the N-3 and 1-9 programs and somewhat less in the 10-12 and Intern programs. Supervision by other university personnel such as subject matter or education specialists or a team of instructors; by a variety of school personnel such as principals, reading specialists, or several cooperating teachers; by other students such as fellow student teachers, Intern students, and pre-student teaching students; and by parents and other community members occur rarely, if at all.

The nature of the supervisory act is primarily an observation of from thirty to forty-five minutes followed by a twenty minute conference between the observer and the observed. Usually the observation is subjective. The observer looks for strengths and weaknesses that he perceives as being important. Observational tools or instruments are used only infrequently. Variation in conferencing concerning time, duration, individuals involved is also infrequent.

Analysis of Programs

In an attempt to provide some perspective for viewing programs, several sets of criteria have been selected for comparison data. The sets of criteria with which the four programs as a whole will be compared are: (1) "Ten Reasonable Expectations" from Behind the Classroom Door by Goodlad and Klein[1], (2) "The Education of Educators" from Crisis in the Classroom by Silberman[2], and (3) "In Search of a New Bird" from On Staying Awake: Talks with Teachers by Sand[3]. Data concerning content goals -- knowledge and skill objectives -- from the four programs will be compared to each of these sources in turn.

"Ten Reasonable Expectations"

The list of expectations developed by Goodlad, Klein and associates for the purpose of studying innovations in primary schools deals with practices one would expect to find in schools ". . . given the frequency with which the concepts behind them have been endorsed over the years."[4] The ten expectations and the knowledge and skill objectives reported previously in this section of the report that seem to be related to each expectation as well as the percent of subprograms or instructors holding these objectives are as follows:

1. Expectation: Classroom practices are guided by clear educational objectives.

   Related knowledge or skill objectives and percent of subprograms having the objectives:

Instructional objectives	56%
Educational goals	38%

2. Expectation: Classroom instruction is guided by emphasis on "learning how to learn."

   Related knowledge or skill objectives and percent of subprograms having the objectives:

Learning theory	88%
Instructional techniques	88%
Problem solving	19%
Self-directed learning	6%

---

[1]John I. Goodlad, M. Francis Klein, and Associates. Behind the Classroom Door. (Worthington, Ohio: Charles A. Jones Publishing Company, 1970), pp. 12-18.

[2]Charles E. Silberman. Crisis in the Classroom. (New York: Random House, 1970), pp. 470-522.

[3]Ole Sand, On Staying Awake: Talks with Teachers. (Washington D.C.: National Education Association, 1970), pp. 29-38.

[4]Goodlad, op. cit., p. .

3. Expectation: Subject matter is intrinsically appealing to pupils.

Related knowledge or skill objectives and percent of subprograms having the objectives:

Specific subject matter	93%
Open classrooms	31%
Problem solving	19%
Creativity	13%

4. Expectation: Materials are available in great number and variety.

Related knowledge or skill objectives and percent of subprograms having the objectives:

Learning materials	93%
Use of media	56%
Games	19%
Programmed learning	13%

5. Expectation: Individual differences in pupils are recognized and being developed.

Related knowledge or skill objectives and percent of subprograms having the objectives:

Individualized instruction	56%
Learning disabilities	44%
Value development	38%
Diagnosing student problems	38%
Open classrooms	31%
Creativity	13%
Nongraded	13%
Self-directed learning	6%

6. Expectation: Teachers are making use of basic learning and instruction principles.

Related knowledge or skill objectives and percent of subprograms having the objectives:

Study of teaching	93%
Instructional techniques	88%
Learning theory	88%
Psychology	25%
Teaching models and theory	6%

7. Expectation: Teachers are making use of group dynamics and interaction knowledge.

   Related knowledge or skill objectives and percent of subprograms having the objectives:

Study of teaching	93%
Interaction analysis	44%
Communication	44%
Classroom questions	44%
Group dynamics	38%
Behavior modification	13%

8. Expectation: Flexible evaluation standards are being used.

   Related knowledge or skill objectives and percent of subprograms having the objectives:

Evaluation	63%
Testing	31%
Open Classrooms	31%
Grading	25%
Nongraded	13%

9. Expectation: Variety in learning settings and participants in learning activities exist.

   Related knowledge or skill objectives and percent of subprograms having the objectives:

Learning materials	93%
Classroom design	31%
Open classrooms	31%
Field trips	25%
Innovative programs	19%
Team teaching	6%

10. Expectation: The curriculum includes science, social studies, and art, and not just reading skills.

    Related knowledge or skill objectives and percent of subprograms having the objectives:

Specific subject matter	93%
Curriculum design	50%

It is, of course, impossible to determine what specifically is meant by the various objectives and if indeed the objectives do focus on the content suggested in the expectations. For example, specific subject matter is listed under the tenth expectation, but there is no way of knowing whether this objective includes treating reading skills as only one aspect of the curriculum or not. Or, learning materials is listed under the fourth expectation, but again there is no way of knowing whether the importance of quantity and variety of materials is stressed or not. Assuming that the ideas suggested in the expectations are given some treatment in the objectives listed, how do the programs being examined in this study compare with this set of criteria? It would appear that when the programs are viewed with these ten expectations some of the programs are conceivably meeting some of the expectations, but in few instances do all programs seem to be concentrating on a given expectation. The expectations with which the programs appear to compare the least favorably are 1, 2, 5, 7, and 8. For expectation 1, goals, and 8, flexible standards, few of the instructors identify any of the related objectives. For expectation 7, interaction knowledge, and 2, learning how to learn, many instructors identify related objectives but many did not select what would seem to be the most important objectives for the expectation. It is reasonable to expect greater identification of interaction analysis if the former is being developed and self-directed learning if the latter is. For expectation 5, individual differences, numerous objectives that may be related are identified, but only a small number of instructors select these objectives. Slightly over half of the instructors identify individualized instruction, for example.

The Education of Educators

Silberman does not provide a "checklist" of ways in which teacher education programs can be improved. He does, however, indicate what he views as needed changes and encouraging directions. Some of these suggestions, related knowledge and skill objectives, and percent of instructors holding each objective follow:

1. Suggestion: Teacher education programs should provide teachers with a sense of purpose -- with a philosophy. They should be infused with a purpose reflecting carefully considered conceptions of education and not place emphasis on proficiency in teaching and discipline. History and philosophy must occupy a central place in teacher education.

   Related knowledge or skill objectives and percent of subprograms having the objectives:

Curriculum design	50%
Educational goals	38%
Philosophy	25%
History of education	25%

2. Suggestion: Students should develop an ability to think about the ways in which curriculum and teaching methods, classroom and school organization, testing and grading influence educational purpose.

   Related knowledge or skill objectives and percent of subprograms having the objectives:

Study of teaching	93%
Curriculum design	50%
Instructional analysis	44%
Educational goals	38%

Testing	31%
Grading	25%
Unit planning	19%

3. Suggestion: Student's ability to nurture creative expression should be developed.

Related knowledge or skill objectives and percent of subprograms having the objectives:

Simulation	50%
Open classrooms	31%
Games	19%
Problem solving	19%
Play	19%
Creativity	13%
Brainstorming	13%

4. Suggestion: Students should gain knowledge about the growth and development of the mind, of the learning process. Emphasis should be placed on psychology, sociology, and anthropology.

Related knowledge or skill objectives and percent of subprograms having the objectives:

Learning theory	88%
Knowledge about communities	50%
Learning disabilities	44%
Group dynamics	38%
Psychology	25%

5. Suggestion: Prospective teachers should be helped to understand themselves.

Related knowledge or skill objectives and percent of subprograms having the objectives:

None

Accepting the same limitations and assumptions mentioned in interpreting the comparison of content objectives to the ten expectations, it can be seen that the programs as a total group do not appear to be focusing on several of Silberman's suggestions. Relatively few subprograms stress philosophy and creativity and none deal with student self development. It is conceivable that thinking and the factors that influence goals are examined, but evidence is not overwhelming.

Silberman also suggests that different types of clinical experiences replace student teaching. An example he gives is the use of a demonstration room filled with materials in which student teachers are placed but no pupils are present.

Student teachers would have to learn how to use the materials, which ones to use first, how they might be employed in teaching. Although the use of centers was found in some programs no program reported this type of clinical experience. Silberman further suggests that live models of what teaching should be must exist and that student teachers should be taught in the manner they are urged to teach. There is no evidence to indicate that these models are provided through the programs, and little evidence exists that many instructors employ their own prescriptions, although direct means of assessing this practice were not employed.

In Search of a New Bird

The direction of education in the 1970's, according to Sand, can be summarized by fifteen generalizations. These generalizations, content goals that appear to be related to them, and percent of instructors employing the goals are as follows:

1. Generalization: Move from the group to the individual.

   Related knowledge or skill objectives and percent of subprograms having the objectives:

Individualized instruction	56%
Open classrooms	31%
Nongraded	13%
Programed learning	13%
Self-directed learning	6%

2. Generalization: Move from self-contained classroom to community wide school. Move from school building use geared to an agrarian society with a nine-month year, limited to children, to school building use reflecting urban society with a twelve-month year available to all age groups.

   Related knowledge or skill objectives and percent of subprograms having the objectives:

Knowledge about community	50%
Open classrooms	31%
Classroom design	31%
Urban schools	25%
Field trips	25%
Political organization of communities	25%
Central-city teaching	19%

3. Generalization: Move from 2x4x6 teacher: stuck between 2 book covers, 4 classroom walls, 6 schoolday periods to the teachers and his staff: man, media, and machines.

   Related knowledge or skill objectives and percent of subprograms having the objectives:

Study of teaching	93%
Learning materials	93%
Classroom design	31%
Innovative programs	19%

Nongraded	13%
Team teaching	6%

4. Generalization: Move from teaching or telling, dispensing information, to teaching or guiding, conducting the dialogue. Move from memory to inquiry.

   Related knowledge or skill objectives and percent of subprograms having the objectives:

Instructional techniques	88%
Learning theory	88%
Classroom questions	44%
Value development	38%
Open classroom	31%
Problem solving	19%
Creativity	13%

5. Generalization: Move from teacher as general practitioner to teacher as clinical specialist -- team member.

   Related knowledge or skill objectives and percent of subprograms having the objectives:

Innovative programs	19%
Nongraded	13%
Team teaching	6%

6. Generalization: Move from spiritless climate to zest for learning.

   Related knowledge or skill objectives and percent of subprograms having the objectives:

Learning materials	93%
Instructional analysis	44%
Open classrooms	31%

7. Generalization: Move from classrooms that are like kitchens to classrooms that are like libraries and living rooms. Move from boxes and egg crates to clusters and zones of space.

   Related knowledge or skill objectives and percent of subprograms having the objectives:

Classroom design	31%
Open classrooms	31%
Nongraded	13%

8. Generalization: Move from scheduled classes to appointments and independent learning.

   Related knowledge or skill objectives and percent of subprograms having the objectives:

Individualized instruction	56%
Diagnosing student problems	38%
Open classrooms	31%
Programed learning	13%
Self-directed learning	6%

9. Generalization: Move from a teaching schedule of 30 hours a week in class with children and 15 hours for planning and correcting to 15 hours a week with children and 30 hours of research, planning, and development.

   Related knowledge or skill objectives and percent of subprograms having the objectives:

Institutional change	25%
School-staff dynamics	19%
Team teaching	6%

10. Generalization: Move from the graded to the nongraded school.

    Related knowledge or skill objectives and percent of subprograms having the objectives:

Open classrooms	31%
Nongraded	13%
Self-directed learning	6%

11. Generalization: Move from supervisors to educational demonstration agents.

    Related knowledge or skill objectives and percent of subprograms having the objectives:

Supervisory roles	19%

(The sets of criteria are compared with the content objectives in this section. This generalization could also be compared with the actual practice of University and cooperating teacher supervision as described earlier. This description reveals that little demonstration is presently being done by supervisors.)

12. Generalization: Move from centralized, narrow-based decision making, conducted mainly by the educational establishment to decentralized, broadly based decision making, including students, teachers, parents, and others along with the establishment.

    Related knowledge or skill objectives and percent of subprograms having the objectives:

Knowledge about communities	50%
Teacher-student relations	38%
Open classrooms	31%
Home-school relations	25%
Institutional change	25%
School-staff dynamics	19%

It seems clear from the comparison of the content objectives to Sand's generalizations that many of these generalizations are quite possibly not being developed.

Although the method of analysis employed in this section is fraught with dangers and the data and conclusions need to be interpreted cautiously, it does appear that many of the criteria for the three lists may not be being met in programs in general. That is not to say that in individual subprograms various criteria are not being developed. However, it does appear that the total program is not emphasizing or stressing the ideas and concepts embedded in these criteria over other ideas and concepts.

DESCRIPTION AND EVALUATION BY PRESENT STUDENTS

Introduction

In the preceeding section teacher education programs were examined in relation to descriptions provided by the university instructors involved in the programs. In this section descriptions and evaluations of various aspects of the programs by students who were participating in them during the investigation are presented and analyzed.

Present student views of the programs were obtained through the Student Questionnaire and the Student Group Interview Schedule. The Student Questionnaire contains 15 questions on various aspects of student teaching and accompanying seminars or group sessions or on preceding methods courses. Of these items 7 request descriptions and 8 call for evaluations. As can be seen in Table IV, 222 students completed the questionnaire. Almost without exception the questionnaires were conscientiously and thoughtfully completed. They were distributed and returned during the last month of the semester.

The Student Group Interview Schedule contains several questions relating to each of 7 major items. Of these items, 2 relate to student personal data, and 5 deal with program descriptions. In addition, part of one item requests evaluation. The interviews were conducted by eight graduate students who had created the schedule. A total of 16 groups with approximately 3 students in each group were interviewed, as can be seen in Table V. The students who submitted to the interview were chosen in one of three ways at their instructor's option: (1) randomly, (2) selected by supervisor, or (3) volunteered. Most groups were composed of students selected by their instructor. Although the length of interviews varied, they generally lasted for an hour. The students appeared to be genuinely interested in participating. Their responses were thoughtful and lengthy. The interviews were held during the last several weeks of the semester.

The organizational plan of this section is to present and discuss the data from the two instruments concerning description first. Following this, evaluative data will be presented and analyzed. The distinction between these two sets of results is somewhat arbitrary in relation to certain items, but in general the researchers were able to label an item as either being primarily descriptive or primarily evaluative.

TABLE IV
NUMBER OF STUDENTS COMPLETING STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

Program	Students	Subprograms
N-3	48	4
1-6	64	6
7-9	19	1
10-12	56	4
Intern	23	3
Unidentified	12	
Total	222	18

TABLE V
NUMBER OF STUDENTS COMPLETING STUDENT GROUP INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

Program	Groups	Students	Subprograms
N-3	2	6	2
1-6	6	21	6
7-9	1	4	1
10-12	3	9	4
Intern	3	10	3
Total	15	50	16

Description

The descriptive items can be sorted into eight categories: seminar goals, seminar content, aspects best prepared in, aspects least prepared in, type of student being prepared, techniques to be tried, tactics to be used, and evaluation. Each of these will be explored in turn.

Seminar goals. Student interviews revealed that generally goals or objectives were established by the instructor prior to the beginning of the seminar or group sessions in all programs and students were made aware of them. In some programs, such as the 1-6 and Intern, there is more student involvement in the goal setting process than in others.

The goals that interviewers identified were neither complete nor formal goal statements. They tended to respond with knowledge and skill areas as topics rather than with actual goal or objective statements. These goal areas in order of frequency of being mentioned in each program are the following:

1. N-3: Self-evaluation, stating objectives, philosophy of education, the learning process, and parent-teacher relations.

2. 1-6: Lesson planning, preparing "worksheets", discipline, individualization, team teaching, reading and social studies, and curriculum.

3. 7-9: Humanistic techniques, communication skills, need fulfillment, self-evaluation skills, and curriculum analysis.

4. 10-12: Teaching competence, problem solving techniques, and independent work.

5. Intern: Group therapy, problem solving, classroom survival, support, reading, verbal and nonverbal communication.

A comparison of these goals as perceived by students with the major or more frequently identified content goals by instructors of the various programs reported in the preceding section shows that there is marginal similarity between the two sets of goals. The areas of congruence for the two lists of goals by program are: N-3 -- learning; 1-9 -- (Combined 1-6 and 7-9) subject matter content, group dynamics, individualization, and planning; 10-12 -- teaching techniques; and Intern -- teaching.

Seminar content. The previous category dealt with knowledge, skill, or other goal areas the various seminars set out to accomplish. This category focuses on the goals that were achieved, on the content that was "covered." The content that was explored in each program in order of frequency of being mentioned is the following:

1. N-3: Social studies, math, science, ITA, phonetics, home-school relations, learning theory, and human relationships.

2. 1-6: Reading, math, social studies, science, inquiry, child study, individualization, using references, grouping, discipline, human relationships, value clarification, administration, and educational psychology.

3. 7-9: Behavioral objectives, curriculum planning, role playing, value clarification, educational psychology, communication, classroom management, analysis of instruction, creativity, and audio-visual materials.

4. 10-12: Teacher ethics, lesson planning, job procurement, discipline, politics, drugs, Flanders' Interaction Analysis, self-evaluation, games, audio-visual materials, homework, discussions, curriculum planning, and scientific method.

5. Intern: Behavioral objectives, individualization, resources and materials, school procedures and record keeping, classroom climate, techniques, teaching as a profession, grading, reading, math, social studies, and science.

When goals are compared with actual content it can be seen that from the students' vantage point a large portion of the goals were not developed in seminar sessions or not much time was spent on them. More specifically, for the N-3 program, learning theory and parent-teacher relations were developed, but self-evaluation, objectives, and philosophy apparently were not. For the 1-6 program, discipline, individualization, team teaching (grouping) and reading and social studies were covered, while lesson planning and other aspects of curriculum received less or possibly no treatment. For the 7-9 program, communication and curriculum were investigated. However, humanistic techniques per se, self-evaluation, and need fulfillment were not mentioned by students as being seminar content. For the 10-12 program teaching competency and problem solving were treated, but independent work apparently received little emphasis. For the Intern program, reading and communication (climate) were developed, but problem solving, survival, and others were not listed as content by students.

Because of the nature of the interview schedule and the small number of students interviewed these comparisons involve considerable risk of error. Readers are reminded to interpret them cautiously.

Comparing the knowledge and skills that were perceived by students to have been actually developed in seminars with the content goals identified by instructors as reported previously, shows greater agreement between actual content and instructor stated goals than student perceived goals. There is much greater actualization of instructor goals than a comparison of the instructor goals and student perceived goals would suggest.

By comparing the three lists -- instructor identified content goals, student perceived seminar goals, and seminar content -- the areas or topics that appear in each list by program are: N-3 -- learning; 1-9 (1-6 and 7-9 combined) -- subject matter content, individualization, and planning; 10-12 -- teaching techniques; and Intern -- teaching. Apparently, these are the content topics that receive major emphasis in the respective programs.

Aspects best prepared in and why. The term "aspect" was difficult for students to interpret on the questionnaire. Most students selected some subject or content area as the aspect in which they felt they were the best prepared, but there were some variations. The aspects by programs were:

1. N-3: The N-K students repeated the terms nursery or kindergarten; they had difficulty being more specific. The 1-3 students listed knowledge of children the most frequently.

2. 1-6: Most students identified reading as the aspect best prepared in. The students of some subprograms selected knowledge of children as the aspect.

3. 7-9: No patterns emerged.

4. 10-12: Students in each of the subprograms list their discipline as the aspect best prepared in. Some identified discussion as the aspect.

5. Intern: No patterns emerged.

It can be seen from this listing that few respondents indicated specific skills and activities as aspects in which they were best prepared. They identified broad, general areas, often as broad as the title of their program. The listing of reading as the aspect best prepared in seems to be in contrast to views of teacher preparation by various other groups of persons.

Most often the experience or event that students identified as having the greatest effect in developing this aspect or area was student teaching. This is true for all programs. Also, listed frequently are seminar sessions, and for secondary students, content background courses. Areas that received no or infrequent mention were specific methods courses, self study, education foundation courses, and personal interest or native qualities. Apparently, student teaching helped the students acquire knowledge and skill more than other activities or elements of the teacher education program.

Aspects least prepared in and why. The aspect or area identified by students of the various programs as the one in which they are least prepared are the following:

1. N-3: No clear pattern emerges, but curriculum planning, classroom discipline, and social studies occur frequently.

2. 1-6: Classroom discipline is identified the most frequently as the aspect in which they are the least prepared. Motivation, science, and math also are mentioned frequently.

3. 7-9: Classroom discipline is mentioned the most often.

4. 10-12: No clear pattern emerges, but planning, content background, and various teaching techniques are mentioned the most often.

5. Intern: No clear pattern emerges, but classroom discipline, schoolmanship, and reading occur frequently.

It seems clear that generally speaking, discipline is the aspect in which students feel least prepared. It is interesting to note that reading is not an area in which students do not feel prepared. Reading was seen as an aspect least prepared in only in one program and in that one it was not a major aspect.

The reason given most often regarding why students felt unprepared in the areas reported above was lack of experience in the student teaching situation. The second most frequently mentioned reason was the absence of seminar or course treatment of the given aspect.

Type of student being prepared. From the students' viewpoint there appears to be little difference among programs concerning the type of student the various programs are trying to prepare. The most frequently mentioned types of student in order of frequency are: (1) well-rounded, (2) flexible, open minded, (3) sensitive to students, student centered, understanding of the student, (4) innovative, change agent, and (5) inner-city. The 7-9 program was the only one that consistently identified the same type of student as the one the program was preparing. The type was humanistic teacher.

Not all comments by students were positive. A small number of students said the type of teacher being prepared was an idealist or theorist who had little practical ability. Others said the programs were producing confused students because the seminars and courses urged students to make innovative changes in school practices, but student teaching situations in which they were placed urged students to continue existing practices. This view when pursued in greater depth during the student interviews appeared to be fairly widespread across all programs. Average was a term used by still others to describe the type of teacher being prepared.

Techniques to be tried. To obtain some idea of what types of instructional innovations students acquired from their programs and would like to employ in schools, they were asked to indicate on the questionnaire what techniques they were particularly interested in trying out in their own classrooms. Although there are some exceptiens, for the most part the students of all of the programs identify individualization as the technique they would like to employ. Also, inquiry and discovery, team teaching, and student freedom and open classrooms were frequently singled out. The exceptions were one 1-6 subprogram in which students listed unit teaching, audio-visual materials, and resource centers, and the secondary programs where students listed panel discussions, audio-visual materials, behavior modification, and simulation as techniques.

It appears that in general students are coming into some contact with several innovative practices and are interested in using them. It should be noted, however, that a sizable portion of students did not identify a technique to be tried. They gave no response to the question.

Tactics to be used. A companion question to the previous one concerned the tactics the student would employ in attempting to try out a new technique in a rather traditional school. The most frequently mentioned tactics for all programs, in order of frequency were:

1. Get approval from the principal.
2. Start with the traditional methods used presently in the school and slowly make a transition to the new method.
3. Prepare thoroughly and then seek approval from the principal. (Conduct a pilot study, obtain findings from other research, read extensively, construct and submit a proposal.)

In addition to these three main tactics, some students indicated they would just close their classroom doors and do it, while others would seek support from colleagues and others leave the school system that is oppressive. Many students said they did not know what tactics to employ.

There were few differences among programs in relation to tactics but there were some differences within programs or among subprograms, particularly in the 1-6 program. Students of one subprogram unanimously said they would just do it, another group said they would consult the principal, while a third said they would thoroughly prepare as the first step.

These findings on tactics suggest that as a whole students are equipped with change tactics that may be labeled traditional rather than radical. They imply some naivete concerning school change.

Evaluation. The process of evaluation and determining grades for the various programs as seen by students is as follows:

1. N-3: Seminar grades are based on completing of assignments and conferences about meeting goals. Students indicated that they were unclear about how student teaching was evaluated. They also indicated that few self evaluative activities were employed.

2. 1-6: Supervisor observation, exams, logs, and assignment completions are used to determine seminar grades. Student teaching evaluation is done by the supervisor. Self evaluative and awareness techniques of role playing and self-selected readings are employed.

3. 7-9: It was unclear to students how both the seminar and student teaching were evaluated. Self evaluation or peer evaluation technique of support groups was employed.

4. 10-12: Seminar was evaluated on basis of final exams, lesson plans, term papers, and conferences. The process of determining student teaching grades was unclear. Self-evaluation methods were not mentioned by students.

5. Intern: Seminar grades are based on attendance and classroom performance, students indicated. The interviewing grade is determined by the supervisor and the cooperating teacher together. Some self evaluation in terms of assessing effective and ineffective methods was employed..

In general, it appears that seminar grades are based on more objective data in the 10-12 program and less objective data in other programs. Student teaching grading practices are somewhat mysterious, and self-evaluation receives little stress.

The grading-evaluation process completes the description of the programs. The following section examines students' evaluations and judgments of various aspects of their programs.

Evaluation

There are eight evaluation categories that will be explored. They are: source of insight into teaching, most valuable aspects of the program, aspects of program that should be eliminated, additions that should be made to the program, strongest features of student teaching, weakest feature of student teaching, ideal program, and evaluation for total program.

Source of insight into teaching. There is general agreement that the student teaching experience (interacting with students, planning lessons, conferencing with the cooperating teacher, etc.) gave by far the most insight into teaching for students of all programs. Also, seminars were seen as being very helpful in conveying an understanding of the nature of teaching. Other sources mentioned with some regularity were independent reading, pre-student teaching courses (i.e., Children's Literature, Educational Psychology, Educational Philosophy), methods courses, and personal previous experiences.

Students of programs that identified specific sources as being helpful were K-3 and 10-12 students. The K-3 students specified a curriculum project as being helpful. The 10-12 students said their methods courses and School and Society were helpful in providing insight.

In summary, there appears to be little doubt that it is through student teaching, and also seminars, that students develop an understanding of the field of teaching.

Most valuable aspects of the program. A general pattern that seems to emerge is the value of the student teaching experience, and in particular, the cooperating teacher. Students in all programs indicate that the student teaching experience is the most important aspect of their program. By program, the most important aspects are:

1. N-3: Student teaching and courses in educational philosophy and psychology, and methods courses.

2. 1-6: Cooperating teacher, methods courses, independent work, home visits, urban education work, and educational philosophy.

3. 7-9: Student teaching, educational psychology and philosophy, seminars, supervisors, and student freedom.

4. 10-12: Cooperating teacher, content courses, educational psychology and philosophy, simulation games.

5. Intern: "Sink or swim" field experience, student freedom, individualization, behavioral objectives, reading, and urban education work.

Aspects of program that should be eliminated. The area that students mentioned repeatedly as one that should be eliminated from their programs is the educational psychology and philosophy foundation course work that precedes student teaching and the courses that accompany it. Music, art, and physical education courses are also mentioned frequently as being useless. More specifically, for each program the aspects students would like to see eliminated are:

1. N-3: Educational psychology and philosophy courses, seminar assignments, general education requirements in Letters and Science, and lack of variety in student teaching assignments. Many students indicated they would like to have fewer seminar sessions.

2. 1-6 and 7-9: Educational psychology and philosophy courses, art, music, physical education, seminar assignments, general education requirements in Letters and Science, a portion of the seminar sessions, and poor cooperating teachers.

3. 10-12: Educational psychology and philosophy courses, theoretical aspects of seminars, music, art, and a major portion of seminars and methods courses.

4. Intern: Many of the seminar sessions, educational psychology and philosophy courses, and theoretical aspects of seminars.

As a whole what the students appear to be saying about their programs is that they want less work in courses or areas that do not deal directly with teaching. They want to eliminate program aspects that they view as being impractical such as general education courses, foundation courses, theory, and unproductive seminar sessions. It is interesting to note that methods or techniques work or courses which receive abuse from many sources are not seen as being superfluous elements of teacher education programs by students.

Additions that should be made to the program. The desire for more practical experiences or useful practices or methods is apparent again. In general, what students would add to their programs are practical topics or aspects and considerably more student teaching and observing. By programs, the areas that students feel should be added are:

1. N-3: Methods work, variety in reading, more classroom observation, more open discussion of problems in seminars, and more guidance and help from cooperating teachers.

2. 1-6: Methods work, especially in reading, social studies, and science.

3. 7-9: More student teaching than just one semester, more observation experiences, and more specific feedback from cooperating teachers.

4. 10-12: Earlier and longer student teaching and observing (many students expressed a desire for an extra semester of student teaching or an internship year), and practical knowledge courses dealing with audio-visual aids, discipline, and organizing classrooms.

5. Intern: More and varied observing experiences, curriculum and instruction planning, and methods work or courses.

Strongest features of student teaching. The strongest feature of student teaching is a "good" cooperating teacher when the cooperating teacher is indeed an able, effective person. For each program individually, the strongest features of student teaching are:

1. N-3: Good cooperating teacher and four different student teaching placements.

2. 1-6: Good cooperating teacher, integration of student teaching and methods work, and in some cases seminar session and supervisors.

3. 7-9: Good cooperating teacher, support groups, and seminars.

4. 10-12: Good cooperating teachers and freedom to try out ideas when freedom does in fact exist.

5. Intern: "Sink or swim" of interning and good coordinating teachers.

Apparently supervisor observation and conferencing, seminar sessions in which student teaching problems and successes are often shared, the type of student teaching placement, the students being taught, and all the other factors that could possibly influence student teaching are seen as being of secondary importance.

Weakest features of student teaching. The weakest feature of student teaching is very consistent with the students' perception of the strongest feature. The overwhelming weakest feature for all programs is a "poor" cooperating teacher when that is what students feel that they have. By "poor" cooperating teacher they mean a person who gives no freedom, who holds conferences infrequently, and who is a weak teacher. Other features mentioned as being the weakest are lack of variety in student teaching experiences and lack of feedback concerning teaching progress. By programs, the most frequently mentioned weakest features are the following:

1. N-3: Poor cooperating teacher, insufficient student teaching experience, seminar sessions, and insufficient feedback.

2. 1-6: Poor cooperating teachers, seminar sessions, lack of variety in student teaching placements, and too many seminars or other course assignments such as papers or reading during student teaching.

3. 7-9: Poor cooperating teacher and insufficient feedback.

4. 10-12: Poor cooperating teacher, insufficient observation and feedback by the supervisor, and not enough variety in student teaching placements.

5. Intern: Insufficient variety in interning placement, insufficient observing of other schools and classrooms, and insufficient feedback.

It is interesting to note that type of placement, particularly inner-city school placement which nearly all students with the exception of some 10-12 students experience, is not viewed as a weak feature. These results and those concerning the strongest feature of student teaching seem to indicate that if the student has a "good" cooperating teacher everything else is of minor importance.

Ideal program. The most striking aspect of the students' description of ideal teacher education programs was the desire for more, earlier, and varied student teaching, more methods courses and work, and careful screening of cooperating teachers. These were three themes that emerged in the description by students of all programs. The most frequently occurring ideal program elements for each program were:

1. N-3: More student teaching, screen and secure better cooperating teachers, provide more methods courses, and provide more opportunity for real discussion in seminar sessions.

2. 1-6 and 7-9: Earlier, more (one semester is insufficient), and varied student teaching, more observing in a variety of schools and classrooms, screen cooperating teachers and match them with students with whom they would be compatible, more methods courses preferrably before student teaching, and fewer seminar sessions.

3. 10-12: Earlier and more student teaching including a capstone internship, and more methods courses.

4. Intern: The present program is seen as being ideal with several exceptions. The students would like more methods courses, greater variety in interning situations and more opportunity for observing, and more seminars with real discussion.

In the descriptions almost no mention was made of greater student freedom and choice in determining their own programs, individualizing or personalizing programs, black culture courses, education foundation courses, or general education courses.

Evaluation of total program. No general patterns emerged either from among or within programs concerning the evaluation of the total program. The letter grades that students were requested to use to indicate their evaluation were primarily "B's" and "C's". Very few "A's" were used. Also, very few "D's" and "F's" were used. What specifically the students were evaluating, or what appeared to be the determining factor in selecting and issuing a particular grade varied considerably. Some of the factors for various individuals were: (1) their perception of their own accomplishments, (2) reaction to general education courses, (3) reaction to the seminars, (4) reaction to student teaching and the cooperating teacher, (5) the view that there is too much theory and not enough practical suggestions, and (6) too many seminar assignments.

Not all students indicated a grade. A small group felt grading was inconsistent with their views of education and could not express or compress their evaluation into one symbol.

Perhaps what can be concluded from this evaluation of the total program is that few students felt they experienced an outstanding, flawless program.

EVALUATION BY GRADUATED STUDENTS

In addition to obtaining data about programs from instructors and from present students, data were obtained from graduated students who have had from one to three years of full time teaching experience and from cooperating teachers. Evaluations from graduated students are reported here. In the following section cooperating teacher evaluations are reported.

The Self-Evaluation Questionnaire for Graduated Students consisting of 29 items was distributed to a random sample of graduated students stratified by programs. Of this sample, 18 questionnaires were returned representing the 5 programs in approximately equal numbers. The results of the questionnaire are summarized in Table VI.

It can be seen from Table VI in which items from the questionnaire are grouped and labeled that the areas in which at least one-third of this small group felt were missing from their teacher preparation or at least were not strong aspects of their programs were practical knowledge, methods, flexibility in adopting plans, analysis of own teaching, classroom management, knowledge of community, knowledge of support services, knowledge of school functioning, and facilitating staff development. The area in which at least one-third of the teachers felt very strongly that they had been prepared was lesson planning. Also, one-third or more of the teachers strongly liked their preparation program and their student teaching experience. There was moderate agreement that the teachers had been prepared in the other identified areas.

Results from general comments on the questionnaire indicate that the graduated students feel that more opportunities for classroom experience and other activities involving students, such as tutoring, prior to actual student teaching would be helpful in preparing for student teaching and in adding perspective to other course work. Also, they seem to feel that there is a greater need for coordination in course work between "theory" and "practical application."

TABLE VI
EVALUATION OF TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS
BY GRADUATED STUDENTS OF
THE PROGRAMS

Characteristics	Evaluations			
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Background				
Theoretical	3	13	2	
Practical	3	2	11	2
Subject matter	3	9	4	2
Methods	2	10	6	
Current issues and problems	5	11	2	
Planning				
Lesson	6	7	5	
Unit	4	9	4	1
Flexibility in adapting plan	1	9	6	2
Teaching				
Motivation skills	3	10	3	1
Evaluation skills	2	8	5	3
Analyze own teaching	3	8	7	
Manage classroom	3	8	6	1
Innovative	4	11	3	
Interested in students	4	11	2	1
School-Community				
Knowledge of community	2	7	7	2
Knowledge of support services	1	5	8	4
Knowledge of school functioning	1	7	8	2
Facilitate staff development	1	4	9	2
General				
Better prepared than other institution's students	2	7	5	1
Helpful university supervisor	5	11	2	
Successful program	3	12	3	
Liked program	6	9	3	
Enjoyed student teaching	8	7	2	

EVALUATION BY COOPERATING TEACHERS

Data concerning cooperating teachers' evaluation of selected aspects of the teacher education programs were obtained with the Student Teacher Evaluation Questionnaire for Cooperating Teachers. This instrument was distributed to a stratified random sample of cooperating teachers of the five major programs. It also contains 29 items and except for the wording of items it is the same questionnaire that was given to graduated students. From the original distribution, 23 completed questionnaires were returned. A compilation of these results is contained in Table VII.

In general the results indicate that the cooperating teachers of the various programs are in moderate agreement that the programs are effective in developing the identified abilities or qualities with several exceptions. The areas in which at least one-third of the cooperating teachers disagree that development has taken place or achievement is at the level specified are practical knowledge, unit planning, evaluation techniques, subject matter preparation, methods background, and classroom management. The areas in which the programs appear to be particularly effective as evidenced by the number of cooperating teachers who indicate strong agreement with the statements are ability to self analyze and interest in students and their development and learning.

General comments from the questionnaire reinforce and further clarify these results. Overwhelmingly, coordinating teachers feel that there is an urgent need for more practical knowledge and experience including classroom methods and management techniques. They see a need for more methods courses prior to student teaching. On the positive side, they indicate that the students' attitudes toward their work and to pupils are very constructive and healthy. Further, they feel the university supervisors are helpful, they value the program in which they serve, and they enjoy the student teacher with whom they have worked.

Because of small sample size the results and those related to graduated students must be viewed as temporary. The general rather than strong agreement with many aspects of the program and the clear disagreement with many other aspects suggests areas to rethink pending investigation with large numbers.

TABLE VII
COOPERATING TEACHER EVALUATION OF STUDENT TEACHERS AND THEIR PROGRAMS

Characteristics	Evaluations			
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Background				
Theoretical	2	14	5	
Practical	1	8	9	4
Subject matter	1	9	11	1
Methods		12	8	1
Current issues and problems	2	16	5	
Planning				
Lesson		15	5	1
Unit		13	9	
Flexibility in adapting plan	2	19	5	
Teaching				
Motivation skills	1	15	5	
Evaluation skills		12	10	
Analyze own teaching	8	15		
Manage classroom	1	9	8	4
Innovative		20	2	
Interested in students	13	10		
School-Community				
Knowledge of community	3	18	2	
Knowledge of support services	2	21		
Knowledge of school functioning	1	20	1	
Facilitate staff development		13	7	
General				
Better prepared than other institutions' students	2	6	6	2
Helpful university supervisor	6	15		
Successful programs	4	15	2	1
Like program	10	11	2	
Enjoy student teachers	15	8		

IV.
RESULTS CONCERNING STUDENTS

In addition to providing a description and analysis of teacher education programs this investigation also sought to describe and examine the students who are participating in the five teacher education programs. The specific topics or areas concerning students with which the study was concerned were general characteristics, educational knowledge level, attitudes toward students, and personality composition. Data concerning these areas were obtained through the Student Information Form, the Knowledge Instrument (KI), the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory (MTAI), and the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule (EPPS). Two hundred and twenty-two students completed and returned the Student Information Form while 192 students completed the other three instruments. All of the 192 students were in the final phase of their programs. The 222 students who completed the information form include the 192 students and other students who were also finishing their program but were unable to be present at the two examination sessions. Also, several students who were in the middle phase of their programs are included in the 222 students.

General Characteristics

The general characteristics of students to be described are sex, age, marital status, racial-religious background, geographic origin, present employment, grade point average, parents' education, teaching as a career choice, and type of school desired. Each of these topics is discussed in turn.

Sex. Of the 211 students who completed this item on the questionnaire, 33 indicated male and 178 indicated female, as can be seen in Table VIII. Roughly 85 percent of the students in the total program are female. The percent of females in each of the five programs is N-3 - 100 percent, 1-6 - 85 percent, 7-9 - 90 percent, 10-12 - 68 percent, and Intern - 85 percent. Although these results are not surprising, they do indicate that male students still are not especially interested in teaching as a profession and when they are their preference is secondary education much more frequently than other levels. Apparently, male students are not attracted to the N-3 program.

Age. As reported in Table IX, most of the completing students who returned the questionnaire are between the ages of 20 and 24 years. In an urban university this age range for graduation might be considered normal or typical. Many students, 36 percent, are older than 24 years when they finish their programs, however. Approximately 13 percent are over 35 years of age. The percent of students over 24 years of age for each of the five programs is: N-3 - 20 percent, 1-6 - 35 percent, 7-9 - 32 percent, 10-12 - 22 percent, and Intern - 50 percent. Excluding the Intern program in which older students would be expected, younger students seem to select the primary and secondary program in greater numbers than older students. Greater numbers of older students appear to choose either the elementary or junior high programs.

Marital status. As might be expected in relation to the above data concerning age, many students are married. It can be seen in Table X that 80 students, or approximately 40 percent, are married. It should be noted that included in the

TABLE VIII
SEX OF STUDENTS COMPLETING PROGRAMS

Program	Male	Female
N-3	0	49
1-6	8	53
7-9	2	19
10-12	18	56
Intern	5	34
Total	33	178

TABLE IX
AGE OF STUDENTS COMPLETING PROGRAMS

Program	Age							
	20-24	25-29	30-34	35-39	40-44	45-49	50-54	55-59
N-3	35	5	1	4	1	3		
1-6	33	9	1	3	3		2	
7-9	13	1	2	2	1			
10-12	38	11	2	4		1		
Intern	16	8	6	1	1		1	1
Total	135	34	12	14	6	4	3	1

TABLE X
MARITAL STATUS OF STUDENTS COMPLETING PROGRAMS

Program	Married	Not Married
N-3	19	23
1-6	23	28
7-9	5	11
10-12	15	40
Intern	18	16
Total	80	118

TABLE XI
GEOGRAPHIC ORIGIN OF STUDENTS AGE 20-25 COMPLETING PROGRAMS
AS MEASURED BY LOCATION OF HIGH SCHOOL

Program	Milwaukee Area	Wisconsin Excluding Milwaukee Area	Out-Of-State
N-3	31	7	
1-6	21	11	3
7-9	9	4	
10-12	27	9	5
Intern	14	1	2
Total	102	32	10

118 students who are not married, are students who have been married but are presently divorced or widowed. By programs, the percent of students who are married are: N-3 - 45 percent, 1-6 - 47 percent, 7-9 - 31 percent, 10-12 - 27 percent, and Intern - 53 percent.

Racial-religious background. Questions on the information form related to race and religion were optional, however most students freely indicated their race and religion. Of the 211 students responding, 5 students, or 2 percent, identified themselves as noncaucasians. Of these 5, three are black, one oriental, and one Indian. In relation to religious preference, all but 35 students listed some religious denomination. Most of these 35 individuals indicated "none" for religious preference or chose not to answer the question. These data concerning student characteristics as those presented above, confirm casual observation of the student population of teacher education programs; the students are almost exclusively white and they have, for the most part, religious backgrounds or orientations.

Geographic origin. Results concerning geographic origin immediately preceding entrance to the university of students age 20-25 are reported in Table XI. It can be seen from the table that the majority of the students in this age range are from Milwaukee and its commuting suburbs. Roughly 70 percent of the students are from the Milwaukee area, 22 percent are from other Wisconsin cities, and 7 percent are from other states. The geographic origin of the students is clearly a local, urban one. By programs the percent of Milwaukee area students is: N-3 - 86 percent, 1-6 - 60 percent, 7-9 - 70 percent, 10-12 - 66 percent, and Intern - 82 percent.

Present employment. Aside from work associated with maintaining a household, approximately 35 percent of the students in the final phases of their program hold jobs ranging from 8 to 60 hours per week. The median hours-per-week is 20. When intern students who are already full-time teaching employees of the Milwaukee Public Schools are not included in the analysis of students presently employed, the percent of students holding jobs outside the home increases to 41 percent. For each program the percent of students employed is: N-3 - 45 percent, 1-6 - 33 percent, 7-9 - 50 percent, 10-12 - 26 percent, and Intern - 10 percent. The percent of intern students working, although lowest of all the programs, is amazingly high considering the other demands on interns' time. Data indicate that several of the interns work as many as 40 hours per week. The comparatively low employment by secondary students is also of interest. One might predict the lowest employment in programs where the professional semester (full-time teaching and integrated course work for one semester) is required such as in all, except one, of the 1-6 programs.

Grade point average. A great deal of similarity exists among the five programs in grade point averages as reported by students on the information form. The students of all programs excluding intern students had approximately the same median grade point average and range of grade point averages. The median was 2.8 and the range 2.3 - 3.8. Approximately 14% of the students reported grade point averages of less than 2.5. The median grade point average for intern students was 2.5, although they may have had some difficulty in reporting their averages because of the variety of ways of recording grade point averages in the various institutions in which they completed their undergraduate work.

Parents' education. Data indicate conclusively that most of the students are first generation college students and, in many cases, the first generation to complete high school as well. Of the mothers and fathers of students of all programs, 61 or 15 percent had eight or fewer years of formal education, 219 or 54 percent attended high school but did not necessarily graduate, and 128 or 31 percent attended college or other post high school institutions but did not necessarily graduate. Most of those who attended college, did not complete their programs and graduate.

The education level attained for fathers and mothers separately in each of the five programs is:

1. N-3 Fathers. Elementary school - 11 percent, some high school - 49 percent, some higher education - 40 percent.

2. N-3 Mothers. Elementary school - 14 percent, some high school - 50 percent, some higher education - 36 percent.

3. 1-6 Fathers. Elementary school - 15 percent, some high school - 56 percent, some higher education - 29 percent.

4. 1-6 Mothers. Elementary school - 13 percent, some high school - 62 percent, some higher education - 25 percent.

5. 7-9 Fathers. Elementary school - 29 percent, some high school - 66 percent, some higher education - 5 percent.

6. 7-9 Mothers. Elementary school - 25 percent, some high school - 40 percent, some higher education - 35 percent.

7. 10-12 Fathers. Elementary school - 22 percent, some high school - 42 percent, some higher education - 36 percent.

8. 10-12 Mothers. Elementary school - 10 percent, some high school - 62 percent, some higher education - 28 percent.

9. Intern Fathers. Elementary school - 5 percent, some high school - 57 percent, some higher education - 38 percent.

10. Intern Mothers. Elementary school - 14 percent, some high school - 43 percent, some higher education - 43 percent.

These findings, indicate that more parents of students in Intern and N-3 programs have attained higher education levels than parents of students in other programs. The parents of students in the 7-9 programs apparently have the lowest level of formal educational attainment.

Teaching as a career choice. Besides the above information concerning students' backgrounds and personal characteristics, they were also asked several questions about teaching. One of these questions dealt with why the student selected education as a career choice. The most frequently given responses in order of frequency for students of all programs combined were: (1) enjoy children, (2) want to help be of service to children, (3) view teaching as a respected and

advantageous profession, (4) like knowledge and scholarship, and (5) want to help create a better world. Approximately 75 percent of the students mentioned liking or enjoying children as the major reason. Few students indicated that desire to improve society was the primary reason. The students in the N-3, 1-6, and 7-9 programs uniformly stated that liking of children and wanting to help children learn were the main reasons. Students in the 10-12 program identified liking of knowledge and scholarship as the major reasons. The reason why interns selected teaching as a career are varied.

These responses seem to indicate that students have little or no personal philosophy of education. They do not seem to sense the influence-power situation in which teachers participate and know what they should or might do with it. They have no clear vision of why they want to teach other than the general, cliche-type reasons that they give. The students who mention helping children or serving children rarely specified their goals; they did not specify how or to what end they wanted to help children. If students had consciously developed personal philosophies of education, it would seem that more responses associated with improving society or man would have been given and the responses would have contained more than broad, general phrases. It is interesting to note that the most specific reasons were those given which could be subsumed under the major category heading of teaching as a respected and advantageous profession. A six-hour work day, nine-month work year, many vacations, pleasant working environment, community status, retirement system, and other reasons were given by these students. Many of these students, however, were older students who had previously experienced one or more types of occupations.

Type of school desired. With little exception, all students indicated that they planned to teach upon completion of their teacher education program if teaching positions are available. A sizable portion of students had identified other types of occupations they might pursue if they were unable to teach, but teaching was their major objective. Apparently, few if any students are using teacher education programs as an "easy" route to a college degree.

The kinds or locations of schools in which students hope to obtain teaching positions vary considerably. For students of all programs combined, 30 percent prefer inner-city schools, 28 percent prefer outer-city schools, 27 percent prefer suburban schools, 11 percent prefer small-city schools, 2 percent prefer rural schools, 1 percent prefer community schools, and 1 percent indicated no preference. The following are preferences by programs:

1. N-3. Inner-city - 29 percent, outer-city - 25 percent, suburban - 37 percent, small city - 9 percent, rural - none.

2. 1-6. Inner-city - 24 percent, outer-city - 31 percent, suburban - 31 percent, small city - 10 percent, rural - 4 percent.

3. 7-9. Inner-city - 49 percent, outer-city - 27 percent, suburban - 12 percent, small city - 6 percent, rural - 6 percent.

4. 10-12. Inner-city - 17 percent, outer-city - 32 percent, suburban - 30 percent, small city - 17 percent, rural - 4 percent.

5. Intern. Inner-city - 48 percent, outer-city - 24 percent, suburban - 16 percent, small city - 12 percent, rural - none.

These data indicate that the students in the 7-9 and Intern programs are the most interested in inner-city teaching while students in the 10-12 program are the least interested in teaching in this type of school. From one-fourth to nearly one-third of the N-3 and 1-6 students would like to teach in inner-city schools, but more students in these programs would prefer suburban schools than any other type.

Educational Knowledge Level

The level of educational knowledge attained by students based on scores on the Knowledge Instrument is reported in Table XII. From this table it can be seen that the total mean score was approximately 43 correct out of a total of 76 items. Although no comparison norms are available for this instrument, a mean of 43 or 57 percent correct appears to be low. One would not expect students in the process of completing programs to miss over 40 percent of the answers on an examination of basic curriculum, teaching, learning, development, historical, and philosophical knowledge of both a traditional and current nature. An item analysis of the instrument was not conducted. However, differences in achievement on the traditional items (1-57) and the current items (58-76) were examined, and it was found that as a total group students incorrectly answered a slightly higher percent of the current items than the traditional.

Differences in mean scores among the five programs are also reported in Table XII. These data indicate that N-3 students had the highest mean score (46.86), 7-9 and Intern students the lowest (41.23 and 41.94), and students of the other programs between these two extremes (42.04 to 43.97). A one-way Analysis of Variance of these differences was computed and it was found that the programs were significantly different at the .065 level of confidence. The Scheffe test of multiple comparisons used to locate the pairs of mean scores that might differ significantly revealed that the N-3 mean is almost, but not quite, significantly different from the 7-9 mean and the 10-12 mean at the .05 level.

In summary, finishing students of the five programs appear to have deficiencies in knowledge level attainment. Comparisons of the five programs indicate that students of some programs may have lower achievement levels than others.

Attitudes Toward Students

Attitudes of the students of the five programs toward the children and youth they taught in student teaching, interning, and other situations are reported in Table XIII. These data, obtained with the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory (MTAI), show that the mean scores of students from the five programs differed considerably. Students in the N-3 program had the highest mean score (76.10) and, therefore, the most favorable attitude toward students. The 1-6 students had the next highest mean score (63.51) followed by 7-9 (50.18), 10-12 (46.50), and Intern (44.67). This decline in mean score in relation to an increase in grade level taught or to amount of teaching experience is to be expected. Analysis of these data with a one-way Analysis of Variance program revealed that significant differences at beyond the .001 level of confidence exist among the means of the five programs. The Scheffe method of multiple comparisons indicated that the pairs of scores that were significantly different at or beyond the .05 level were N-3 and 10-12, N-3 and Intern, and 1-6 and 10-12. The difference between N-3 and 7-9 approached the confidence level. Apparently the more favorable attitudes of N-3 students than several of the other programs and the less favorable attitudes of the 10-12 students than several of the other programs are not chance differences.

TABLE XII
KNOWLEDGE INSTRUMENT MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS BY PROGRAMS

Program	Mean*	Standard Deviation
N-3	46.86	6.03
1-6	43.97	7.96
7-9	41.23	6.73
10-12	42.04	8.06
Intern	41.94	7.50
Total	43.27	5.96

*F-ratio of 2.257 indicates significance at p≤.065

TABLE XIII
MINNESOTA TEACHER ATTITUDE INVENTORY
MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS
BY PROGRAMS

Program	Mean*	Standard Deviation
N-3	76.10	22.61
1-6	63.51	28.16
7-9	50.18	31.93
10-12	46.50	37.03
Intern	44.67	28.26
Total	56.96	32.21

*F-ratio of 5.509 indicates significance at p<.001

The N-3 students have favorable attitudes toward children, but this mean and the means for all of the other groups are strikingly low MTAI mean scores when compared to other samples as can be seen in Table XV. In this table the total mean of the five groups, 57.0, is compared with 64.0, the mean score of 200 graduate students taking introductory graduate courses. This difference was found to be significant at the .01 level. It should be noted that the graduate student mean is a lower mean than any normative data presented in the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory Manual for undergraduates and, therefore, presents a more rigorous test of comparison.

The low scores on the MTAI are perplexing and call for exploration. One possible explanation centers on the type of student teaching and interning experienced by the students. By far the majority of teaching experience is presently obtained in inner-city schools many of which have children who often find it difficult to conform to expectations. This kind of situation could result in poorer attitudes toward children. Another way to view the situation, however, is to say that the students have more realistic, not necessarily poor, attitudes toward children. Their scores at this stage in their development are comparable to the mean scores of experienced teachers (55.1 at the elementary level and 40.8 at the secondary level). A longitudinal study of the students of the five programs to determine if their present scores are stable over time or if they decline even further with experience would be valuable in interpreting the meaning of these low MTAI mean scores.

Personality Composition

Student personality traits or manifest needs which were determined with the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule (EPPS) are contained in Table XIV. Examination of this table reveals that students of the five programs differed as a group from each other in several respects. Significant differences were found in relation to 3 of the 15 variables which constitute a "need pattern." In achievement and intraception the programs differed significantly at the .075 level, while in dominance they differed significantly at the .05 level of confidence. Achievement refers to the need to do one's best and to be successful with tasks that require skill and effort, intraception refers to the need to be introspective with respect to the feelings and motives of oneself and others, and dominance refers to the need to be a leader or a person who controls the course of events. When the Scheffe test was applied to these data and others to uncover groups contributing to this significant result, it was found that at the .05 level N-3 students are significantly less dominant than 7-9 students and approaching the significance level with respect to 10-12 students. Also, 1-6 students are less dominant than 7-9 students at a level approaching significance. In relation to achievement and intraception the N-3 students are less achievement oriented and more intraceptive at a level that again is nearing significance. The Scheffe test was also applied to scores for nurturance -- the need to provide encouragement and assistance to others. It was found that N-3 students are significantly more nurturant than 7-9 students at the .05 level.

Total mean scores for all students together along with selected sample norms and confidence intervals are presented in Table XV. The college sample means reported in the table are based on 1509 students enrolled in liberal arts classes. The teacher sample means are based on 657 experienced elementary and secondary teachers. It can be seen from Table XV that compared to liberal arts students, the students enrolled in the five programs have significantly greater need at the .01 level for autonomy, intraception, nurturance, and change, and a significantly lesser need at or beyond the .05 level for deference, dominance, abasement, and heterosexuality. Autonomy refers to the need to be independent in thought and action, change refers to the need to experiment and be involved in new and different activities, deference refers to the need to follow the lead of others and to praise others, abasement refers to the need to feel personal guilt for the actions of oneself and others, and heterosexuality refers to the need to be with and enjoy the company of members of the opposite sex. Compared to experienced teachers, it can be seen from Table XV, that the students of the five programs have significantly greater need at the .01 level of confidence for autonomy, intraception, change, heterosexuality, and aggression and lesser need for deference, order, abasement, and endurance. Aggression refers to the need to attack and criticize the thoughts and actions of others while endurance means the need to work hard and keep at a task until it is completed.

What these results seem to indicate is that the students in the five programs have fewer of the needs usually associated with experienced teachers, and more of the needs usually associated with liberal arts college students. That is, the professional students have a lesser need for deference, order, endurance, and abasement, and a greater need for autonomy, change, intraception, and aggression. They appear to be much more oriented toward vigorous innovation, reliance on self, and being of service to others than experienced teachers and even than liberal arts students. Two areas in which the students have less need than liberal arts students are dominance and heterosexuality. The low dominance scores seem to indicate that although the students of the five programs are interested in autonomy and change, they are not particularly interested in actually leading the change or controlling the course of events to bring about change. They are no more interested than experienced teachers. The heterosexuality scores are puzzlingly low, but they are significantly higher than experienced teachers.

Comparing present professional students with samples of college students and experienced teachers that were taken from 6 to probably over 15 years ago does involve certain risks and could result in inaccurate interpretations. It is possible, for example, that the two norm samples also have different need patterns today than they did when the samples were taken. Perhaps both experienced teachers and college students and the general population are more dominant, autonomous, and change oriented than they were. Perhaps, although the professional students are self-reliant, concerned, and personally involved, they are less so than their current counterparts in liberal arts.

TABLE XIV
EDWARDS PERSONAL PREFERENCE SCHEDULE
MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS
BY PROGRAMS

Variables	N-3		1-6		7-9		10-12		Intern		Total	
	$\overline{X}$	S.D	$\overline{X}$	S.D	$\overline{X}$	S.D	$\overline{X}$	S.D	$\overline{X}$	S.D	$\overline{X}$	S.D
Achievement*	13.0	4.3	13.1	4.2	14.2	5.3	15.2	4.3	14.8	3.4	13.9	4.4
Deference	11.7	3.2	10.9	3.9	11.5	3.9	10.9	4.0	12.3	3.9	11.2	3.8
Order	9.8	4.5	10.5	4.5	10.1	3.5	9.9	4.6	10.1	3.2	10.2	4.3
Exhibition	14.4	3.1	14.0	3.3	13.7	4.2	14.0	3.3	15.0	5.0	14.1	3.6
Autonomy	14.1	4.8	14.2	4.5	13.9	4.8	14.8	4.4	13.6	4.4	14.3	4.5
Affiliation	16.9	3.6	15.9	4.5	15.1	4.8	15.4	4.2	15.7	3.2	15.8	4.2
Intraception**	20.7	3.7	18.0	5.3	17.5	4.2	16.9	5.4	17.3	4.9	17.9	5.1
Succorance	10.7	4.2	11.1	4.7	10.8	4.3	11.5	4.9	12.4	4.5	11.2	4.6
Dominance***	12.0	2.8	13.6	4.5	16.4	5.3	15.0	5.3	15.0	4.3	14.3	4.8
Abasement	12.8	4.6	11.8	4.9	12.0	5.7	11.6	5.0	12.8	5.9	12.0	5.1
Nurturance	17.6	3.9	15.8	5.0	14.2	3.9	16.3	4.4	15.2	4.8	15.9	4.6
Change	19.1	4.5	17.6	5.6	19.3	4.5	17.4	4.9	17.1	5.0	17.8	5.1
Endurance	12.5	4.6	11.9	4.7	13.9	3.8	12.4	5.4	12.5	4.8	12.4	4.8
Heterosexuality	13.5	6.1	13.7	5.9	15.2	6.2	15.4	6.3	14.1	5.2	14.4	6.0
Aggression	10.9	4.1	11.9	5.3	11.7	4.9	12.8	4.2	12.0	5.3	12.0	4.8

*F-ratio of 2.342 indicates significance at .075
**F-ratio of 2.359 indicates significance at .075
***F-ratio of 3.252 indicates significance at .05

TABLE XV
TOTAL MEANS, COMPARISON MEANS, AND CONFIDENCE INTERVALS FOR EPPS, MTAI, AND KI

Variables	Sample Means			Confidence Intervals+	
	Student Teachers	College Sample	Teacher Sample	95 percent	99 percent
EPPS					
Achievement	13.9	14.4	14.3	13.28 - 14.52	13.08 - 14.72
Deference	11.2	11.8**	14.1*	10.66 - 11.74	10.49 - 11.91
Order	10.2	10.2	12.8*	9.59 - 10.81	9.4 - 11.0
Exhibition	14.1	14.3	13.6	13.59 - 14.61	13.43 - 14.77
Autonomy	14.3	13.3*	12.8*	13.66 - 14.94	13.46 - 15.14
Affiliation	15.8	16.2	16.2	15.21 - 16.39	15.02 - 16.58
Intraception	17.9	16.7*	16.8*	17.18 - 18.62	16.95 - 18.85
Succorance	11.2	11.6	11.5	10.55 - 11.85	10.34 - 12.06
Dominance	14.3	15.8**	13.5	13.62 - 14.98	13.41 - 15.19
Abasement	12.0	13.7*	13.9*	11.28 - 12.72	11.05 - 12.95
Nurturance	15.9	15.2*	15.5	15.25 - 16.55	15.04 - 16.76
Change	17.8	16.4*	16.6*	17.08 - 18.52	16.85 - 18.75
Endurance	12.4	12.7	14.7*	11.72 - 13.08	11.51 - 13.29
Heterosexuality	14.4	16.0*	12.7*	13.55 - 15.25	13.28 - 15.52
Aggression	12.0	11.7	11.0*	11.32 - 12.68	11.11 - 12.89
MTAI	57.0		64.0*	52.44 - 61.55	51.0 - 63.0
KI	43.3			42.21 - 44.39	41.87 - 44.73

+Intervals which do not include the Mean for the College Sample or the Teacher Sample can be said to be significantly different than those samples at the .05 and .01 level of significance, respecitvely.

*Significant at .01 level

**Significant at .05 level

V
CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

The questions which this study attempted to answer were broad, general questions about student teaching and accompanying seminars or course work and about students themselves. Many conclusions can be drawn from the varied and multiple results. The attempt here is not to formulate all the conclusions that could be drawn from the investigation, but rather to select a few general conclusions that seem to be of significance.

Implications from a study such as this are equally varied and numerous. Only a short list of implications, in question form, is provided, however. The reader will undoubtedly have a list of his own following examination of the research report. The conclusions and implications for programs and for students are presented separately. Under programs they are further divided into program content and student teaching.

PROGRAMS

Program Content

Conclusions. The following are some of the conclusions that can be drawn about the subject matter content of the programs:

1. Curriculum patterns employed are primarily activity or core. Separate subject or broad fields patterns are used infrequently.

2. The major objectives of the programs are to develop child-centered teachers and innovative teachers. Several topics associated with the objective of innovative teacher do not seem to be major aspects of the content instructors intend to teach, however. Developing urban teachers appears to be a secondary objective and content topic.

3. The content that instructors intend to teach and the content that students perceive as having been taught appear to be fairly similar. In general, content consists of a general study of teaching, subject matter content, materials, instructional techniques, learning, planning, evaluation, and professionalism. The adequacy of the treatment of these topics, however, depends on the particular instructor. Within this general framework students seem to feel they are best prepared in content areas, particularly reading, in learning, and in techniques. Innovative practices such as individualization, inquiry, and open-classrooms are apparently dealt with to some extent in some programs.

4. Content areas that may be lacking from programs or are receiving minor emphasis are: (1) philosophy, theory, and design, (2) classroom interaction and group dynamics, (3) self-understanding of students, (4) school organization such as team teaching, nongradedness, and individualization, (5) the decision making process involving students, parents, community and others, (6) functioning in classrooms of the future, (7) tactics for implementing change, (8) urban education topics such as minority cultures, community relations, and institutional change, and (9) classroom management.

5. The knowledge background that students acquire seems to have some deficiency. Neither traditional knowledge nor current knowledge is strong.

Implications. Some questions that emerge from these conclusions are:

1. Should the content areas in which programs are deficient or which presently receive minor emphasis be given major emphasis?

2. Should a curriculum design or curriculum plan concerning education subject matter content as well as other aspects of a total teacher education program exist which could give guidance to instructors? Would some form of a teacher education "curriculum guide" serve a useful purpose?

3. Should senior faculty who are experts in various phases of content (i.e., social studies, urban education, curriculum philosophy, etc.) become involved in programs on a sustained, regular basis? Should senior faculty experts become the instructors of the seminars or courses in some new type of organization?

4. Should more time be devoted to seminars or courses so that the content can be treated adequately? Should the programs be restructured to permit more or longer class sessions? Should methods courses precede student teaching?

Student Teaching

Conclusions. The following are some of the conclusions that can be drawn about student teaching and field experience:

1. The student teaching experience is the single most important aspect of the total teacher education program from students' point of view.

2. The major, if not only, factor in determining whether a student teaching experience is a valuable one or not is whether the cooperating teacher was "good" or "bad." Students tend to judge their entire four-year teacher education program as successful or unsuccessful on the basis of the quality of cooperating teacher or teachers to whom they happen to have been assigned. With a "good" cooperating teacher, students overlook or become unconcerned about other shortcomings in their programs.

3. Students perceive a majority of the cooperating teachers as being inadequate. They feel that many of the cooperating teachers are too restrictive and authoritarian, provide little and ambiguous feedback about student teaching progress, and are ineffective teachers who are not current in their practices and knowledge.

4. A one-semester student teaching experience is insufficient for students to develop the competencies they feel they need. The one-semester experience is neither long enough nor varied enough to meet students' needs.

5. The total quantity and quality of field work is insufficient.

6. New forms of supervision are beginning to be employed by instructors but are not widespread.

Implications. Some of the questions that emerge from these conclusions are:

1. Should a careful screening program to identify adequate cooperating teachers be developed and implemented? Should this screening program be coupled with an intensive training program for cooperating teachers?

2. Should student teaching be extended to two semesters and should students have teaching experience in a variety of schools?

3. Should there be a greater variety of and more extensive field work in addition to student teaching? Should it begin sooner and last longer?

4. Should there be more innovations in supervisory practices and student teaching placement such as some of those that are beginning to be used in student teaching centers?

STUDENTS

Conclusions. Conclusions that can be drawn concerning students completing teacher education programs in terms of general characteristics are the following:

1. The typical student is a female between the ages of 20-24, although quite likely to be older than 24, who is white, is religious to some extent, and whose home is either in Milwaukee or one of its suburbs. Chances are 1 of 2 that she is married, 1 of 3 that she is employed (for approximately 20 hours per week), and 2 of 3 that her parents did not attend college. Her grade point average is likely to be 2.8

2. The manifest needs of the typical student are different from that of experienced teachers. She has a greater need for autonomy, intraception, change, heterosexuality, and agression, and lesser need for deference, order, abasement, and endurance.

Conclusions in terms of educational interests, attitudes, and knowledge are:

3. The typical education student chose teacher education as a program and teaching as a possible career because she likes children and wants to be of service to them. Choice is not based on a well thought out, clearly delineated position. Upon completion of a program, chances are 2 out of 3 that she will not wish to teach in an inner-city school.

4. Attitudes toward children and youth of the typical teacher education student are less favorable than teacher education students of the past. This could signal a more realistic, mature attitude toward children or simply a poorer attitude.

5. Knowledge acquisition upon completion of the teacher education program of the typical student is not extensive.

Implications: Several questions that these conclusions raise are:

1. Should a screening program to identify the best qualified candidates for teacher education programs be developed and implemented? Do students who are admitted to programs possess the characteristics that would contribute to teaching success and the advancement of education in general?

2. Should students have a clearer idea of why they have selected education as a field of study and what they plan to do or accomplish when they become teachers? Should they have a clearer sense of purpose and commitment?

3. Should students have different attitudes toward children and youth than they do?

In summary, one overall conclusion that could be made concerning the findings of this investigation is that the teacher education programs in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction appear to be attempting to prepare technically competent teachers to assume positions in existing elementary and secondary schools in general. Although to some extent topics such as community relations, open classrooms, institutional change, and others are being dealt with in some programs, and student teaching centers are beginning to emerge, in large measure it appears that the programs at present do not have a vigorous urban thrust, a future orientation emphasis, or a strong experimental posture.

APPENDICES

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

APPENDIX A

Weekly Log

NAME_____PROGRAM_____PERIOD COVERED_____

Please respond to the following questions or directions in relation to your course, seminar, or group sessions held during the past week. Be as specific as you can in your descriptions. Return the completed form to Robert Ubbelodhe's mailbox. Thank you.

I. What were your objectives or what do you think your students "learned" during the past week as a result of your course or seminar sessions?

II. Describe the activities, content, and/or materials you utilized (or your students engaged in or utilized) during the past week.

III. Describe how your students were evaluated if evaluation took place during the preceding week.

APPENDIX B

PROGRAM EVALUATION

INSTRUCTOR INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

NAME_____PROGRAM_____DATE_____

I. Seminar/Course Work

(1) In terms of course work, what materials, content, and/or activities do you have your students utilize or engage in?

(2) What is the sequence or organizational pattern in regard to the materials, content and/or activities utilized in your course?

(3) What skills do you desire your students to acquire or develop as a result of their course work?

(4) What knowledge, information and/or facts do you desire your students to acquire as a result of their course work?

(5) How and by whom are your students evaluated?

(6) What are the goals or objectives for the course or seminar experience?

II. Student Teaching Field Experience

(7) What are the time, duration and conditions of student teaching; i.e., when in terms of course work does the field experience take place, how long does it last, what type of school would a typical student be placed in. Is there a preferred organizational setting; e.g., non-graded, team teaching...?

(8) What is the role/s of the student teacher in the classroom - e.g. observer, or aide - and if a variety of roles are assumed, how are these roles sequenced?

(9) What are the roles played by the university supervisor, co-operating teacher, school administrator/s and any other person assigned some responsibility for the student teaching experience?

(10) What knowledge or kinds of knowledge do you desire your students to acquire or develop as a result of their student teaching experience?

(11) What skills do you desire your students to develop or acquire as a result of their student teaching experience?

(12) How and by whom are your student teachers evaluated?

(13) What are the goals or objectives for the student teaching experience?

III. Total Programs

(14) How would you describe the type of teacher you feel your program is trying to educate?

(15) What role do you desire your students to assume after they graduate?

(16) Do you see any incouraging trends or worthwhile innovations in teacher education in the USA or other coutries?

(17) Are you considering or planning to try any innovations in your program at this point?

(18) What are your over-all goals for students in your program?

(19) In view of your goals for your program, how do you evaluate what you're program is currently able to do for, with and/or to students?

APPENDIX C

PROGRAM EVALUATION

Student Questionnaire

Student Name_____ Group/Program_____

Student Number_____ Instructor/Supervisor_____

Directions: Please answer each of the following questions. Be honest and specific. We want to know what you really think. Throughout the questionnaire the phrase "university experience" is used. This refers to integrated group if you are a N-3 or 1-6 student; to the methods course and student teaching seminar if you are a secondary student; or to the weekly seminar if you are an intern. It does not refer to any other professional course work.

1. In what aspect of teaching do you feel best prepared right now?

2. To what do you attribute this confidence?

3. In what aspects of teaching do you feel least prepared right now?

4. To what do you attribute this lack of competence?

5. Which aspects of your university experience gave you insight into teaching?

6. Which aspects of your university experience should be eliminated from the curriculum?

7. What aspect or topic would you add to the curriculum?

8. If you could redesign the university experience you have had what would you select as an ideal program? Describe it in detail. (Use back if necessary.)

9. What were the strongest features of your student teaching experience?

10. What were the weakest features of your student teaching experience?

11. If you were asked to redesign the student teaching experience, what program would you purpose? What would your ideal student teaching program be?

12. What kind of teacher do you feel the School of Education is trying to prepare?

13. When you have your own classroom, what teaching techniques are you particularly interested in trying? Where did you learn these techniques?

14. As a new teacher describe what steps you would take in attempting to try out a new teaching method or technique in a school that is rather traditional.

15. If you were asked to grade the total university and student teaching experience you have had, would you give it an A, B, C, D, or F grade? Why would you assign this particular grade?

APPENDIX D

PROGRAM EVALUATION
STUDENT GROUP INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

DIRECTIONS TO INTERVIEWER: Your job is to get as much information on these various topics as you can. Every question need not be asked each person. Questions may be expanded as you feel necessary, if you perceive something significant may be coming out. You may reword any question. Those questions with * are especially important to use.

1. Personal characteristics
   What reasons do you have for wanting to be a teacher?
   What experiences have you had which make you say that?
   How long a teaching career do you anticipate?
   What is the highest academic degree for which you think you might study?
   Do you plan for a career in education other than for classroom teachers?

2. Course goals
   *How were the content goals set for your university course or seminar at the beginning of this semester?
   Did the instructor identify any? What were they?
   Did the students set any? What were they?
   Have you as a group redefined goals, re-set goals, evaluated goal coverage during the semester?
   Have you kept to the pre-defined course outline, or has it evolved according to need?
   *What were the actual goals or objectives of your course or seminar?

3. Goal achievement
   Have you covered as much in the course or seminar as you thought you would in the beginning? (If not, say what was missed.)
   *What topics have you covered in the course or seminar this semester? (List them.)
   Have any of the activities or experiences you've been put through in your course or seminar seemed like a waste, from this point in time? (Say which ones.)
   Have any been of particular value? (Say which.)
   Given your four year college experience, what stands out as memorable in your training to be a teacher?

4. Evaluation
   What do you think you have to do to please your instructor? (Brainstorm.)
   What method will be used in determining your course grade?
   What would you have to do to get a failing mark in the work? (List.)
   Have you been exposed to any activities which have helped you know yourself better? (What were they?)
   What have you learned about getting feedback from pupils? Have you learned anything about using that feedback? What?
   How will your grade for student teaching be figured?

5. Prophecy
   In what ways would you want your pupils to be different after having had contact with you?
   What would you be willing to accept as evidence that you were being unsuccessful at some facet of teaching?
   What would you be willing to accept as evidence that you were being successful?

6. Concept of preparation
   In what features of being a teacher do you feel least prepared right now? (Explain.)
   In what facets of being a teacher do you feel most ready to contribute? (List.)

7. Perception of UWM program
   Would you say your UWM experience, particularly in student teaching or course/seminar, had taught you more to go out and help change the schools, or to fit in? (What is your evidence for that point of view? Do you agree with this bias?)
   Would you say UWM emphasizes more strongly that you learn skills in human relations concepts, or in basic skills concepts? (What is your evidence?) Have your personal values been in harmony with this perception?
   Do you perceive UWM as having a vision of the ideal teacher graduate? (What is the thrust of the UWM teacher training program?)

APPENDIX E

Self-Evaluation Questionnaire for Graduated Students

NAME (OPTIONAL)_____ SCHOOL_____

Years taught_____ Grade Level(s)_____

UWM Teacher Education Program (i.e., K-3, 1-6, Sec. Ed., etc.)_____

Year Graduated_____

Please answer each of the following questions in relation to your teacher education program at UWM.

	Strongly Agree 1	Agree 2	Disagree 3	Strongly Disagree 4	Comments 5
1. I received a strong theoretical background in education.					
2. I received a strong practical background in techniques and methods of teaching.					
3. I learned how to write lesson plans.					
4. I learned how to plan a unit.					
5. I learned how to motivate children.					
6. I learned how to adopt plans to children's needs and interests as these became apparent during a lesson or activity.					
7. I learned appropriate methods and techniques for evaluating children's progress.					
8. I learned how to contribute to the professional advancement of the staff.					
9. I acquired skill in analyzing and evaluating my teaching.					

	Strongly Agree 1	Agree 2	Disagree 3	Strongly Disagree 4	Comments 5
10. I acquired knowledge about current issues and problems in education.					
11. I gained understanding of the community and its relation to school.					
12. I learned about the supportive services and facilities available to teachers.					
13. I acquired a strong background in subject-matter areas.					
14. I acquired an adequate background in methods for teaching various content areas.					
15. I learned about the school's professional structure and operating methods.					
16. I acquired skill in classroom management techniques and methods.					
17. I acquired knowledge about learning and development of children or youth.					
18. I learned about ways for contributing to professional growth of the staff.					
19. My experiences at UWM helped me to be an innovative teacher.					
20. I received a better preparation for teaching than other teachers I am aware of (from other schools of education).					

	Strongly Agree 1	Agree 2	Disagree 3	Strongly Disagree 4	Comments 5
21. My UWM supervisor and instructor were generally effective and helpful.					
22. I would rate the program I was in as generally successful.					
23. I enjoyed the program I was in.					
24. I enjoyed my student teaching experiences.					

GENERAL COMMENTS:

1. If you were to grade the teacher education program you were in, would you give it an A, B, C, D, or F? Would you briefly explain your answer.

2. In what aspect/s of teaching were you best prepared by your teacher education program?

3. In what aspect/s of teaching were you least prepared by your teacher education program?

4. Was there anything in your teacher education program which you feel might be eliminated to make room for some other needed experience?

5. What experiences would have added to your teacher education program?

PLEASE FEEL FREE TO MAKE ANY ADDITIONAL COMMENTS YOU FEEL ARE NEEDED OR MIGHT BE HELPFUL INCLUDING COMMENTS ABOUT THIS FORM AS A METHOD FOR COLLECTING INFORMATION ABOUT UNIVERSITY PROGRAMS.

Thank you for participating in the evaluation.

APPENDIX F

Student Teacher Evaluation Questionnaire for Cooperating Teachers

NAME _____ SCHOOL_____

UWM Group or Program worked with most recently_____

Number of years you have taught_____

How many years have you worked with student teachers?_____

	Strongly Agree 1	Agree 2	Disagree 3	Strongly Disagree 4	Comments 5
1. The student/s I worked with had a strong theoretical background in education.					
2. The student/s I worked with had a strong practical background in techniques and methods of teaching.					
3. The student/s I worked with knew how to write lesson plans.					
4. The student/s I worked with knew how to plan a unit.					
5. The student/s I worked with knew how to motivate children.					
6. The student/s I worked with knew how to adapt their plans to children/s needs and interests as these became apparent during a lesson or activity.					
7. The student/s I worked with knew appropriate methods and techniques for evaluating children's progress.					
8. The student/s I worked with were able to contribute to the professional advancement of the staff.					

	Strongly Agree 1	Agree 2	Disagree 3	Strongly Disagree 4	Comments 5
9. The student/s I worked with were interested in analyzing and evaluating their own teaching.					
10. The student/s I worked with were knowledgeable about current issues and problems in education.					
11. The student/s I worked with attempted to understand the community in which the school is located.					
12. The student/s I worked with made an attempt to learn about the supportive services and facilities available to teachers.					
13. The student/s I worked with had a strong background in subject-matter areas.					
14. The student/s I worked with had an adequate background in methods for teaching various content areas.					
15. The student/s I worked with attempted to understand the school's professional structure and operating methods.					
16. The student/s I worked with were proficient in classroom management techniques and methods.					
17. The student/s I worked with were interested in the children they were working with.					

	Strongly Agree 1	Agree 2	Disagree 3	Strongly Disagree 4	Comments 5
18. The student/s I worked with were able to contribute positively to the professional growth of the staff.					
19. The student/s I worked with were innovative teachers.					
20. The student/s I worked with were better prepared for teaching than are other student teachers I am aware of (from other education schools.)					
21. The university personnel I worked with were generally helpful to their students.					
22. I would rate the program I worked with as generally successful.					
23. I enjoyed working with this program.					
24. I enjoyed working with my student/s.					

GENERAL COMMENTS:

1. If you were to grade the teacher education program you worked with, would you give it an A, B, C, D, or F? Would you briefly explain your answer.

2. In what aspect/s of teaching was your student best prepared by his teacher education program.

3. In what aspect/s of teaching was your student least prepared by his teacher education program.

4. Is there anything in the student's teacher education program which you feel might be eliminated to make room for some other needed experience?

5. What experiences would you add to the student's teacher education program?

PLEASE FEEL FREE TO MAKE ANY ADDITIONAL COMMENTS YOU FEEL ARE NEEDED OR MIGHT BE HELPFUL INCLUDING COMMENTS ABOUT THIS FORM AS A METHOD FOR COLLECTING INFORMATION ABOUT UNIVERSITY PROGRAMS. Thank you for participating in the evaluation.

APPENDIX G

PROGRAM EVALUATION

Student Information Form

Directions: Please provide the following requested information. We realize that many of the questions are personal and there may be a reluctance on your part to answer them. As complete answers as possible will be appreciated, however.

I. General

NAME_____ STUDENT NUMBER_____

ADDRESS_____ PHONE_____

PROGRAM_____ INSTRUCTOR-SUPERVISOR_____

AGE_____ SEX_____ MARRIED_____ CHILDREN_____ (no.)

II. Education

LIST OF SCHOOLS ATTENDED:

ELEMENTARY

_____
NAME CITY STATE

JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL

_____
NAME CITY STATE

HIGH SCHOOL

_____
NAME CITY STATE

WHAT WAS THE SIZE OF YOUR SENIOR CLASS? _____

COLLEGE

_____
NAME CITY STATE

UNDERGRADUATE GRADE POINT AVERAGE TO DATE_____

III. Employment

LIST THE JOBS WHICH YOU HOLD AND HAVE HELD FROM PRESENT TO PAST (Be as specific as possible)

DESCRIPTION	HOURS PER WEEK	DATES
DESCRIPTION	H P W	DATES
DESCRIPTION	H P W	DATES
DESCRIPTION	H P W	DATES

IV. Family Background

IN WHAT TYPE OF COMMUNITY HAVE YOU LIVED THE LONGEST?

A. RURAL_____ SMALL CITY_____ SUBURBAN_____ URBAN_____

B. 25,000 or less _____ 100,000 to 500,000 _____

25 to 50,000 _____ 500,000 to 1,000,000_____

50 to 100,000 _____ Over 1,000,000 _____

C. HAS THE MAJORITY OF YOUR LIFE BEEN SPENT IN THE GREATER MILWAUKEE AREA?

YES _____ NO _____

WOULD YOU DESCRIBE YOUR BACKGROUND AS:

UPPER-CLASS _____ UPPER-MIDDLE CLASS _____ MIDDLE CLASS _____

LOWER-MIDDLE CLASS _____ LOWER CLASS _____

WHAT WAS THE HIGHEST DEGREE OR GRADE LEVEL IN SCHOOL COMPLETED BY:

FATHER _____ MOTHER _____

WHAT IS YOUR RACE AND ETHNIC BACKGROUND?

WHAT IS YOUR RELIGION PREFERENCE?

V. Personal Interests

GIVEN TIME WHEN YOU ARE NOT IN CLASS, WORKING, OR STUDYING, WHAT KINDS OF THINGS DO YOU ENJOY DOING?

VI. Professional Goals

WHAT TYPE OF SCHOOL DO YOU PLAN TO (OR WANT TO) TEACH IN? RANK IN ORDER OF PREFERENCE (1 = FIRST CHOICE, 2 - SECOND CHOICE, ETC.)

URBAN - INNER-CITY _____

URBAN - OUTER-CITY _____

SUBURBAN _____

SMALL CITY _____

RURAL _____

APPENDIX G

Information Form

IF YOU DO NOT PLAN TO TEACH, WHAT DO YOU PLAN TO DO AFTER GRADUATION?

BRIEFLY DESCRIBE WHY YOU ARE WORKING ON A DEGREE IN THE FIELD OF EDUCATION AND IN THE PARTICULAR AREA OF EDUCATION YOU ARE PURSUING.

APPENDIX H

KNOWLEDGE INSTRUMENT
PROGRAM EVALUATION COMMITTEE

Remarks:

Thank you for helping us gather our data!
It will take about an hour for you to answer these questions.
Some of them may deal with subjects you have never studied. Rather than guess wildly, please DO NOT answer the questions about which you have no idea at all.

Directions:

Put the letter of the correct answer on your answer sheet
Do not write on the booklet of questions.
DO NOT answer questions for which you have no information.
BEWARE of questions with wordings including LEAST, NOT, MOST, EXCEPT, etc.

APPENDIX H

1. Of the following, the one that LEAST describes a principle of classroom motivation is that

   (A) the motivation should be brief
   (B) the motivation should be related to the new work being introduced
   (C) the motivation should be related to the experiences of the pupils
   (D) interest in the subject for its own sake is always an adequate motivation

2. In order to implement the aims and objectives of the junior high school, the science teacher should NOT

   (A) make certain to study each child as an individual and provide for the normal, bright, and slow learners
   (B) encourage and help pupils to explore and sample the fields of biology, geology, and zoology
   (C) assist all pupils in acquiring competence in independent study through effective study habits
   (D) encourage all pupils to go on to college

3. Of the following, the problems which are of LEAST value in stimulating real thinking are those

   (A) which pupils solve in many ways
   (B) which pupils solve in one way which has been thoroughly practiced
   (C) in which pupils encounter extraneous data
   (D) which pupils cannot solve because of insufficient data

4. Of the following statements concerning questioning, which one is NOT consistent with current thinking?

   (A) Some questions, though perfect in form, may challenge only a limited number of pupils
   (B) Vague and incomplete questions tend to confuse pupils.
   (C) "Chorus" answers do not afford all pupils an opportunity to think.
   (D) Questions starting with "why" and "how" should generally be avoided.

5. The BEST homework assignment to assist pupils to prepare for a test is which one of the following?

   (A) to tell them to study for a test
   (B) to give them a set of problems identical to those that will appear on the test
   (C) to tell them to prepare a set of questions they think should appear on the test
   (D) to tell them the scope of the test and to assign specific study references and specific practice material covering the scope

6. Of the following, the MOST important factors to be emphasized in discussing occupations with elementary school children are

   (A) training requirements and abilities to be developed
   (B) national and local labor trends
   (C) attitudes and feelings about various levels of work
   (D) salary and promotional possibilities in relation to abilities

7. Of these statements concerning grouping, select the one which is CONTRARY to present-day thinking:

   (A) In a social studies class, grouping enables the teacher to meet individual differences.
   (B) Results of inventory tests may be used as one of the bases for forming groups.
   (C) Teachers should avoid attaching any status value to groups.
   (D) Once in a group, a pupil should be kept there for the rest of the year.

8. Standardized achievement tests are characterized by all of the following principles EXCEPT:

   (A) they often show differing results, depending upon the particular form of the test used
   (B) they are administered in accordance with uniform procedures indicated in the manual of instructions
   (C) they have norms for grade or age
   (D) they are scored in accordance with standard procedures indicated in the manual of instructions.

9. Of the following statements about marks, the one which is NOT correct is:

   (A) Excessive emphasis on marks may cause the pupil to consider the mark more important than the material to be learned.
   (B) The pupil may rely too heavily on mere memory in order to get high marks.
   (C) Occasionally, overemphasis on marks may lead to cheating.
   (D) Marks based solely on written tests give a valid measure of a pupil's achievement, because they are always objective.

10. Which one of the following statements concerning skills and drills is NOT true?

   (A) To maintain skills in mathematics, it is necessary to provide distributed practice of a variety of processes.
   (B) Traditionally, "drill" has meant the routine application of the law of "exercise" whereas "practice" involves repetition in a variety of situations.
   (C) Suitable provision must be made for helping the learner to be aware of his own progress.
   (D) All pupils in a class should be given the same drill in a given skill.

11. A temporary psychological adjustment wherein one attributes one's faults, weaknesses, and wishes to others is called

(A) regression (B) projection (C) repression (D) sublimation

12. Of the following, a technique that is especially useful for the study of inter-pupil relationships in a group or classroom situation is the

(A) anecdotal record
(B) sociogram
(C) Rorschach Test
(D) Thematic Apperception Test

13. A test which measures that which it sets out to measure is said to be which one of the following?

(A) consistent (B) subjective (C) valid (D) reliable

14. A pupil has acid splashed on his face. The teacher washes the affected area and then should

(A) send the pupil home
(B) report the accident to the principal
(C) send for an ambulance
(D) call the parent on the phone

15. In a science class where the majority of pupils have IQ's lower than 85, great emphasis should be placed on which of the following

(A) game-like activities for sensory-motor training
(B) committee reports based on group research
(C) drill and review activities
(D) adaptation of subject matter to the interests and needs of the pupils.

16. A teacher wrote anecdotal observations about some of the children in her classroom. Of the following, the BEST example of anecdotal comments is:

(A) Cannot take responsibility; there probably is insufficient supervision in Roy's home.
(B) Lillian bought candy for all the children again; she is so thoughtful.
(C) Carol's behavior probably reflects the conflict in her home; today she threw an eraser at Tom and spit at Mary.
(D) Mark did not participate in reading today; he just sat and listened as he read a comic book behind his own book.

17. Of the following, the one which is generally considered by experts in learning theory to be essential to learning is

(A) motivation
(B) at least average intelligence
(C) a competent teacher
(D) ability to read

18. Johnny tells his teacher that he and his friends have been cheating on exams in class. Of the following, the BEST immediate course for the teacher to pursue is to

(A) report this to the appropriate school authorities
(B) point out to Johnny that this is not desirable behavior
(C) tend to disbelieve other things Johnny tells him
(D) try to understand why Johnny is telling him this

19. The theorists who hold that learning to read involves seeing wholes first, learning details later, and then learning without awareness of details, are referred to as

(A) gestaltists
(B) behaviorists
(C) existentialists
(D) neo-Freudianists

20. Of the following, which one should occur LEAST in a pupil's cumulative record?

(A) grades and test data
(B) life history and anecdotal data
(C) data on physical growth and development
(D) interpretation and opinion

21. The method whereby a teacher is able to study, within a relatively short period of time, the typical behavior of children at different stages of development, is called the

(A) cross-sectional approach
(B) longitudinal approach
(C) experimental approach
(D) analytical approach

22. When a dog learns to withdraw his foot from a grid at the sound of a bell and, in doing so, avoids the electric shock, the bell is considered

(A) the unconditioned stimulus
(B) the conditioned stimulus
(C) the unconditioned response
(D) the conditioned response

23. Of the following statements, the most valid negative criticism of oral reading during group work is that

(A) some children are unnerved by it
(B) it is an outmoded technique
(C) some pupils are held back by being required to "keep the place"
(D) pupils dislike reading aloud

24. Of the following concepts, the one LEAST consonant with John Dewey's philosophy of education is

(A) learning through experience
(B) extrinsic motivation
(C) emphasis on the learner rather than on the subject
(D) democracy and pragmatism

25. All of the following statements concerning standardized testing are true, EXCEPT:

(A) The operation of chance factors can bring about variations in scores.
(B) Individual tests are more likely to be valid in a given case than are group tests.
(C) The results of first-grade tests are likely to be invalid.
(D) IQ tests should be administered more than once during the K-6 years.

26. Studies dealing with stability of IQ's of culturally deprived children who stay in underprivileged environments show

(A) a steady decline in median score with age
(B) a stable IQ although below the national average
(C) an unpredictable direction of average IQ score due to individual differences
(D) slight increase in IQ score due to exposure to TV, radio, etc.

27. All of the following are averages commonly used in treating educational data except

(A) mean (B) mode (C) median (D) frequency

28. In the modern program of teaching mathematics, drill

(A) is unnecessary
(B) is more important than it ever was
(C) should come after understanding has been acquired
(D) is not necessary below grade 3

29. In a class for adolescent children, it is observed that a negative correlation exists between CA and IQ. This means that

(A) there is no relationship between CA and IQ
(B) there is a negligible relationship between CA and IQ
(C) children with the higher CA's often have the higher IQ's
(D) children with the higher CA's often have the lower IQ's

30. Late yesterday afternoon, Michael, an 8 year old child who had not given the teacher any trouble all term long, violently attacked another child in class for no apparent reason. The teacher should quell the disturbance and

(A) send him to the principal
(B) talk with him after class about the incident
(C) refer the case to child guidance specialists
(D) send a note home to his mother

31. In the course of a conversation with the parent of a child in your class, she indicates that she "cannot understand why he is so stupid; his brothers and sisters all had good marks in school." You should

(A) ignore her references to the other children
(B) tell her that her attitude to the slow child is detrimental
(C) indicate how she may help the child at home
(D) tell her that her child will never measure up to his siblings

32. In general, the language development of girls is

(A) more rapid than that of boys
(B) less rapid than that of boys
(C) equal to that of boys
(D) more rapid than that of boys in oral communication, but slower in written communication.

33. Of the following, the most important determinant of a favorable learning environment is the

(A) physical setting of the classroom
(B) course of study used
(C) interpersonal relationships in the classroom
(D) age range of the children

34. John, a withdrawn child, often brings curious objects to class such as dead frogs, a broken clock, and pictures from old magazines. The teacher should

(A) ignore his bizarre behavior as much as possible
(B) speak to him privately about leaving such objects at home
(C) hold the objects for him until the end of the day
(D) organize class discussions around the objects

35. Mary and Helen each have an IQ of 67 on the Stanford-Binet, Form M. Mary has a reading grade of 3.4 and Helen a reading grade of 3.3. These data suggest that

(A) the reading level is in terms of the IQ for both
(B) Mary's IQ must be higher because her reading grade is higher
(C) Helen's progress in general will be slower
(D) general school achievement cannot be predicted from the above results

36. In discussing discipline at an individual parent-teacher meeting, the teacher should try to get the parent to understand the meaning of discipline as

(A) immediate punishment for any infraction of a rule
(B) complete permissiveness so as not to develop any sense of frustration or failure
(C) self-control developed over a long period through understanding, kindness, firmness, and consistency
(D) immediate and unquestioning obedience to adults in authority.

37. Of the following statements about unusually bright or gifted young children, the one which is INCORRECT is that they are

(A) generally superior in size, muscular control and general health to others of the same age
(B) usually one-sided in their emotional development
(C) usually not eccentric, not queer, and no more unstable than children of "average" mental ability
(D) often difficult to identify at an early age

38. Of the following purported characteristics of slow learners, the one which is usually true is that they are

(A) as much interested in gaining recognition and success in school as faster learners are
(B) very good in manual work
(C) usually motivated by tasks that require constant repetition and little understanding
(D) usually superior to their chronological peers in physical development

39. Good teacher-pupil planning in a class entails

(A) acceptance of all pupil suggestions
(B) strict adherence to the plan
(C) the teacher's playing a minor role in the planning session
(D) teacher and class evaluation of their success in achieving the plan

40. In current educational philosophy and practice, guidance is considered to be

(A) the province of the trained practitioner exclusively
(B) a matter of relatively minor importance
(C) the concern of all teachers
(D) a matter for agencies other than the school

41. Among the contributions made by the "Gestalt" psychologists is the idea that

(A) the individual reacts to a total environment
(B) a particular isolated stimulus will lead to a specific response
(C) the best method of learning is through "conditioning"
(D) each "faculty" of the brain must be provided with appropriate exercise

42. Of the following suggested approaches to the problem of the restless child, the best is that he should be

(A) required to sit still for disciplinary reasons
(B) given frequent changes of activity
(C) given a great deal of written work to keep him occupied
(D) permitted to get up and move around at will

43. It is generally held that children frequently do not like poetry because

(A) it is artificial in structure
(B) the language content is not that which is heard in common speech
(C) it is often taught so analytically that interest in the emotional content is destroyed
(D) the rhythm is too regular

44. Research has shown that neighborhood gangs tend to be more cohesive than groups of the same age functioning as clubs in more formal youth agencies. This would suggest that

(A) the club is potentially longer-lived than the gang
(B) young people join clubs only if they are not accepted by the gang
(C) clubs will not be able to function adequately in a given neighborhood until some way is found to destroy gangs already in existence
(D) the activities of the gang meet the needs of its members better than those of the club program do

45. Of the following, the single characteristic most important in determining an individual's status in a group of pre-adolescent boys is

(A) intelligence
(B) physical ability
(C) school marks
(D) language development

46. In order to use standardized test results as a basis for a remedial program for a class, a teacher should

(A) use the average grade score made by the class to determine the level at which to begin instruction
(B) begin instruction at the level attained by the poorest pupil
(C) use the items failed by pupils making the highest scores to determine the topics which need emphasis
(D) analyze the items that most frequently failed to develop an inventory of common errors

47. A psychological report indicates that a student has been given a Rorschach test. This was used to

(A) test mental ability
(B) discover interests
(C) determine artistic talent
(D) evaluate personality adjustment

48. First in order of time, in the history of American education came the

(A) high school
(B) Latin grammar school
(C) academy
(D) normal school

49. The intensive study of individuals over a fairly long period of time represents the

(A) cross-sectional approach
(B) longitudinal approach
(C) clinical approach
(D) biographical approach

50. During the elementary school years, boys generally exceed girls in

(A) rote memory
(B) number manipulation
(C) word building
(D) use of English

51. Alice is a high school girl who has a tendency to stutter. Of the following suggestions as to what her English teacher might do to help Alice, the one that is best is to

(A) handle the classroom situation so as to encourage Alice to relax
(B) call on Alice suddenly to avoid anticipatory nervousness
(C) urge Alice to concentrate carefully on each sound as she speaks
(D) have Alice change her handedness through a series of easily graded exercises

52. Which of the following procedures would you expect to increase the reliability of a test?

(A) increasing the length of the test
(B) increasing the number of people tested
(C) increasing the number of types of items on the test
(D) increasing the homogeneity of the group tested

53. The visual defects of children tend to be overlooked by teachers because

(A) visual defects rarely interfere with school work
(B) most visual defects are compensated for by other physical traits
(C) children often learn to make temporary accommodation to their visual defects
(D) visual defects cannot be detected without clinical examination

54. Studies of the early history of gifted children reveal that, in general, they begin to walk

(A) and to talk at about the same age as typical children
(B) at an earlier age than typical children but begin to talk at about the same age as typical children
(C) at about the same age as typical children but begin to talk at an earlier age than typical children
(D) and to talk at an earlier age than typical children

55. "Transfer of training" occurs more fully among

(A) morons
(B) dull individuals
(C) bright individuals
(D) normal individuals

APPENDIX I

The Manifest Needs Associated With Each of the 15 EPPS Variables Are:

1. ach Achievement: To do one's best, to be successful, to accomplish tasks requiring skill and effort, to be a recognized authority, to accomplish something of great significance, to do a difficult job well, to solve difficult problems and puzzles, to be able to do things better than others, to write a great novel or play.

2. def Deference: To get suggestions from others, to find out what others think, to follow instructions and do what is expected, to praise others, to tell others that they have done a good job, to accept the leadership of others, to read about great men, to conform to custom and avoid the unconventional, to let others make decisions.

3. ord Order: To have written work neat and organized, to make plans before starting on a difficult task, to have things organized, to keep things neat and orderly, to make advance plans when taking a trip, to organize details of work, to keep letters and files according to some system, to have meals organized and definite time for eating, to have things arranged so that they run smoothly without change.

4. exh Exhibition: To say witty and clever things, to tell amusing jokes and stories, to talk about personal adventures and experiences, to have others notice and comment upon one's appearance, to say things just to see what effect it will have on others, to talk about personal achievements, to be the center of attention, to use words that others do not know the meaning of, to ask questions others cannot answer.

5. aut Autonomy: To be able to come and go as desired, to say what one thinks about things, to be independent of others in making decisions, to feel free to do what one wants, to do things that are unconventional, to avoid situations where one is expected to conform, to do things without regard to what others may think, to criticize those in positions of authority, to avoid responsibilities and obligations.

6. aff Affiliation: To be loyal to friends, to participate in friendly groups, to do things for friends, to form new friendships, to make as many friends as possible, to share things with friends, to do things with friends rather than alone, to form strong attachments, to write letters to friends.

7. int Intraception: To analyze one's motives and feelings, to observe others, to understand how others feel about problems, to put one's self in another's place, to judge people by why they do things rather than by what they do, to analyze the motives of others, to predict how others will act.

8. suc Succorance: To have others provide help when in trouble, to seek encouragement from others, to have others be kindly, to have others be sympathetic and understanding about personal problems, to receive a great deal of affection from others, to have others do favors cheerfully, to be helped by others when depressed, to have others feel sorry when one is sick, to have a fuss made over one when hurt.

9. dom Dominance: To argue for one's point of view, to be a leader in groups to which one belongs, to be regarded by others as a leader, to be elected or appointed chairman of committees, to make group decisions, to settle arguments and disputes between others, to persuade and influence others to do what one wants, to supervise and direct the actions of others, to tell others how to do their jobs.

10. aba Abasement: To feel guilty when one does something wrong, to accept blame when things do not go right, to feel that personal pain and misery suffered does more good than harm, to feel the need for punishment for wrong doing, to feel better when giving in and avoiding a fight than when having one's own way, to feel the need for confession of errors, to feel depressed by inability to handle situations, to feel timid in the presence of superiors, to feel inferior to others in most respects.

11. nur Nurturance: To help friends when they are in trouble, to assist others less fortunate, to treat others with kindness and sympathy, to forgive others, to do small favors for others, to be generous with others, to sympathize with others who are hurt or sick, to show a great deal of affection toward others, to have others confide in one about personal problems.

12. chg Change: To do new and different things, to travel, to meet new people, to experience novelty and change in daily routine, to experiment and try new things, to eat in new and different places, to try new and different jobs, to move about the country and live in different places, to participate in new fads and fashions.

13. end Endurance: To keep at a job until it is finished, to complete any job undertaken, to work hard at a task, to keep at a puzzle or problem until it is solved, to work at a single job before taking on others, to stay up late working in order to get a job done, to put in long hours of work without distraction, to stick at a problem even though it may seem as if no progress is being made, to avoid being interrupted while at work.

14. het Heterosexuality: To go out with members of the opposite sex, to engage in social activities with the opposite sex, to be in love with someone of the opposite sex, to kiss those of the opposite sex, to be regarded as physically attractive by those of the opposite sex, to participate in discussions about sex, to read books and plays involving sex, to listen or to tell jokes involving sex, to become sexually excited.

15. agg Aggression: To attack contrary points of view, to tell others what one thinks about them, to criticize others publicly, to make fun of others, to tell others off when disagreeing with them, to get revenge for insults, to become angry, to blame others when things go wrong, to read newspaper accounts of violence.